THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. IV, No. 2 (Whole No. 61.) | NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1931 | PRICE 5 CENTS

Labor Faces Year of Fight to Live

The American working-class faces the year 1931 with heavy losses behind it and with long, hard and militant struggles in front of it, if it is to resist successfully the savage onslaught against it in the future. In one of the country's foremost bourgeois economic reviews, we read:

"We estimate that the current rate of annual income of all workers, exclusive of those in agriculture and Federal employ, is approximately 35 billion dollars, as compared with a peak rate in 1929 of about 44.6 billion. This represents a **decline of 9.6 billion, or 21.5 per cent.** The most severe reductions have occurred in the building and metal trades. In manufacturing industries, unusually severe declines have been registered in most branches of textiles and iron and steel, and in lumber, leather, brick and tile, glass, brass and bronze, automobiles, agricultural implements, electrical equipment, pianos and organs, rubber products and automobile tires."

The Decline in Workers' Income

This decline in the workers' income is hardly transitional. As was pointed out in the last issue of the **Militant,** it is the expression of a definite trend in boss class strategy and has only reached the first stages of development. With the fall in the purchasing power of the masses, the economic crisis continues to deepen. According to the bourgeois statisticians, business has dropped about 30 percent "below normal." Despite all of Hoover's optimism, despite the promises of the politicians and the mockery of the "buy now" campaigns, sales have descended to new lows, regardless of the continuous downward curve of commodity prices.

An extremely interesting computation has been made by Dr. Lewis H. Haney of the N. Y. U. Bureau of Business Research (see the statistical table printed below)

Highly significant are not only the composite figures, which are comprehensive enough, but also those for **machine tool orders,** which Dr. Haney terms "barometric". The difference there is one of more than 95 points between November 1929 and November 1930, with 1926 as "normal" or 100. To predict a quick recovery on the basis of these figures is beyond all reason. Even the rise in automobile production is characterized as "of doubtful significance. . . In our opinion, consumer purchasing power [payrolls. Ed.] has been so reduced that automobile producers must remain closereefed during the first half of 1931." This abysmally low ebb of production in the basic industries, combined with the perpetual, cancerous agrarian crisis has had similarly disastrous reverberations on the stock market. The World Almanac for 1921 tells us that:

	Nov. 1930	Oct. 1930	Nov. 1929	Oct. 1929	High 1929	Low 1927
Manuf. Products	83.0	86.0	105.0	117.0	128.0	99.0
Employment	76.9	79.0	95.5	98.8	101.0	93.2
Automobile Prod.	61.0	51.0	98.6	130.2	175.0	61.2
Machine Tool Orders	49.0	71.1	145.2	254.2	305.9	103.4
Sales, Finished Steel	60.3	73.5	82.4	127.0	169.9	92.9
Unfilled Orders	——	70.9	88.4	86.7	97.7	75.2
Stocks Manuf. Goods	——	123.1	118.9	119.0	113.8	116.6
Wholesale Sales	77.0	85.0	98.0	102.0	103.0	92.0
Dept. Store Sales	98.0	102.0	108.0	112.0	114.0	104.0
Payrolls	73.9	77.5	102.9	109.1	112.5	99.2
Composite	**72.4**	**78.1**	**104.5**	**131.3**	**151.2**	**93.1**

The Bank Failures

"Total listings [on the Stock Exchange] increased nearly one-third at 1,296,845,244 shares, had a market value of $55,025,710,617 or an average of $42.43 per share, on November 1, 1930 as compared with $87, 073,-680,423 or $63.06 per share, for 1,048,359,362 shares on October 1, 1929." While the number of shares has risen by about 250,000,000, their value as a whole has fallen by close to $33,000,000,000 within the last year or to nearly one half their value per share. "In banking, outstanding credit has been reduced by $5,000,000,000. . . . Fully $16,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 of our member bank funds continue tied up in loans on securities and in investments." With the results that: Failures of banks in the U. S. in 1930 were more than double **in number** and **more than four times geater in liabilities** than in 1929." With "the number of failures as 934 and the liabilities as $908,157,788 compared with 437 involving $218,796,562 in 1929" (Report by R. G. Dun and Co.)

The failure of the Bank of the U. S. at the end of the year was by no means a culminating point in the process. On the contrary, it was simply proof that the bigger banks would not escape the ravages of the crisis and that the future will further undermine their solvency. A Washington dispatch to the New York **Times** of January 8, states:

"The daily average volume of Federal Reserve credit outstanding during the week ending Jan. 7, as reported by the Federal Reserve banks, was 11,355,000,000. **a decrease of $44,000,000** compared with the **preceding** week and of **$220,000,000** compared with the **corresponding week in 1930."**

The shrinkage of credits extended by the Federal Reserve Board, coupled with the tie-up in funds—in loans on securities and in investments—involves a whole series of new bank crashes very shortly, and all the attempts of the government to execute mergers, to intensify control, to force through a system of separate "thrift accounts" and restrict loans, as well as all other preventive measures of a similar nature, are bound to hit against the wall of inner contradictions of the profit system, especially aggravated by the crisis.

It is the duty of the Communists to point out these developments and their consequences, as well as to propagate them. To compete with bourgeois demagogues in organizing the petty-bourgeois bank depositors for the "struggle" around their bank books and grocery stores, by inflaming all their petty and futile property-instincts—as is being done so disgracefully by the official Communist party leadership—is to make a caricature of revolutionary tasks, and to compromise Communism in the eyes of the class-conscious workers. The task of Communists in respect to the small bourgeoisie, is to explain and convince them of the absolute inevitability of the collapse of capitalism. Politically, to neutralize and detach them from the bourgeoisie. As to the workers who are hit by these events, their struggle bears a very distinct class character but the tasks before them are concentrated on an entirely different front.

To think that the capitalist system has already reached the precipice, however, is utter self-deception. The flight of American capital to foreign enterprises, the opening up of the Chinese market by a stabilization of the silver standard in the Orient (in which American capitalists are taking the initiative), further rationalization at home and above all the extension of layoffs and wage-cuts, these are the ways by which stricken capitalist economy is attempting a solution. The degree of their success or failure depends in very great part, upon the militancy of the American workers.

The official organ of the labor skates, who only last year sang eulogies of the bosses and their "rugged American individualism" (for workers only) concluding class truces with them and lulling labor into inaction, reports "with alarm":

"Figures **for dividend payments of all corporations** for 11 months of 1930 were **above 1929** by **$346,600,000—11 percent . . .** Adding interests payment to dividends, the figures are $7,287,600 for 11 months in 1930 against $6,882,300,000 for the same period in 1929, an **increase of $405,300,300.** Standard Statistics estimates the **decreased in wage payments** in all industries this year has been $8,800 million. **(American Federationist,** January, 1931.

But are the bureaucrats of the A. F. of L. thinking of struggle even now? Hardly. They merely ask, in the voice of the timid, boot-licking lackeys that they are, "whether the profits of the recent prosperity have been wisely spent." They whiningly plead that pittances granted to the workers from these profits "would be a sustaining force not only to business but to the social standards [sic!] of our whole nation."

While the labor fakers strive to keep down the proletariat by their zealous services to the bosses, the task of the Communists is to expose them and to rally the workers for struggle by a broad united front on a basis of immediate demands such as the thirty-hour week without wage-cuts, recognition and credits to the Soviet Union, social insurance paid by the bosses and their government. The organization of real mass unemployment councils on an industrial basis, uniting the workers and the jobless must be carried out without the methods of mechanical control which only serve to abort them. The main danger to the revolutionary movement lies in a relapse into opportunism, so illuminatingly revealed by the recent election and petition campaigns of the Stalinists, who today pretend to advance the Communist party. A broad united front led by the Communists must unfold the defensive of the workers and train them in collective struggle for class solidarity and the successful offensive.—S.G.

A New «Relapse into Trotskyism» in Russia

In the course of the last four weeks, **Pravda** has once more been devoting great attention to "Trotskyism", which has allegedly been dead and buried for some time. **Pravda** in recent days regretfully establishes the fact that **"the new Oppositionists come forward for the most part under the banner of Trotsky",** that **"the struggle must be conducted unremittingly against the relapses into Trotskyism",** etc.

We will only set down a few quotations. **Pravda** of December 12 says: **"It has been discovered (!) that in the nucleus of the shoe factory 'The Paris Commune' in Moscow, the bureau, including the chairman of the trade union section and all the other responsible party functionaries, was composed of former Trotskyists."** A number of names are cited. So, despite the capitulations and recognitions of the "general line", the workers in "The Paris Commune" have once more succumbed to the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists! Or is it perhaps a question of petty bourgeois who retreat before difficulties? . . .

A Terrible Traitor

Pravda of December 18: A long, two-column article declares that the nucleus of the Communist Academy at Leningrad conceals many opportunists. There are today, for instance, still eight members who presented a resolution in which they declare that the Central Committee and **Pravda** are **"responsible for the mistakes of recent times."** At the voting, five others, besides the eight who voted in favor, abstained. **Pravda** treats them as conciliators. It appears that the rector of the same Academy, Uvarov, wrote a book "The Economic Policy of the Soviet State", which, in its 179 pages, does not as much as make the slightest attack against the Right. A certain comrade Kurotskin catches the fact and—mark you—Kurotskin is expelled from the university for that and is jeered at as the most vulgar of traitors.

Now, after the central bodies have intervened, the nucleus has once more been obliged to correct its "errors". . .

Another comrade, Belov (of the same Academy) declares in an article that **"the party undertook the attack against the capitalist elements only in the recent period".** This justified reproach is called by **Pravda** a "confused conception".

In the nucleus of the Centrosoyuz also, all is not in good order. **Pravda** of December 12 speaks "of the necessity of uprooting all the symptoms of the disease." This time it is comrade Ignatiev, the nucleus secretary who is raked over the coals in the usual way. **Pravda** prints the title: "The Leadership of the Centrosoyuz Nucleus under the Fire of Self-Criticism".

The inspector of a whole district in the Donetz Basin openly defends, at a party meeting, the opinions of Trotsky and declares that the general line of the party is wrong. **Pravda** speaks of "counter-revolution hidden in the party" and other things of the same stripe. Many comrades, experienced as old militants of the party, who still occupy responsible posts declare openly in conversations that **"comrade Trotsky was right in his criticism of the internal régime in the party, in the question of the rhythms of industrialization and collectivization,"** that **"one can hardly breathe in the party,"** that **"the old cadres of the party are being destroyed while the youth is not being educated in the Marxist spirit,"** that "the whole struggle has long ago ceased to have a political character and revolves solely around tre recognition of the infallible leader Stalin".

Rykov is liquidated. None of his capitulations did him any good. Bucharin has left his partisans in the lurch. Hundreds of them have been driven out of the party. Radek is loyal, but "Stalin is very conservative in his conceptions and does not want

continued on page 2

Hoover Attacks Labor Press

Ever since the beginning of the present crisis, the capitalist politicians, the capitalist press and the government have been conducting a fierce attack on working-class organizations and particularly against their press. The Fish Committee was the official signal for the campaign. Thus far we have witnessed serious attacks on the flanks of the Communist movement. The Right-wing **Revolutionary Age, Vida Obrera,** Spanish organ of the Communist Party, **The Young Worker,** official paper of the Communist Youth League, and the **Liberator** of the American Negro Labor Congress, have all been banned from the mails within recent months. Fish and the government patrioteers are organizing anti-Communist meetings, preparing the mob spirit against the Reds, calling for the ruthless suppression of Communistic propaganda, etc. The entire revolutionary labor press is under fire. All class-conscious workers must come to the defense of their papers and join actively in the fight against the threats and reprisals of the boss government.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT

at the Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

Admission 25c **Come Early**

Unemployed admitted free upon presentation of Unemployed Council card.

Auspices: New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

JANUARY 17:
The Present Crisis - What Next?
Speaker: ARNE SWABECK

JANUARY 24:
The Theory of the Permanent Revolution
Speaker: MAX SHACHTMAN

Molotov Takes Rykov'sPlace

The decision of the Central Committee of the U. S. S. R. to free Rykov from his functions as chairman of the People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R. "upon his own request", has only confirmed a state of affairs that has existed for many months. This measure was prepared by many stages: campaign in the press, cutting off a part of the power by the designation of Syrzov to the chairmanship of the People's Commissars of the Russian Republic, vacations "for reasons of health", and finally dismissal "upon his own request". The struggle against the Right is now entering into what could be called the stage of organizational measures.

The continuous fire of the press which prepared the attack has accomplished its task: now it is the "light cavalry" of the Control Commission, of the agents of the G. P. U. **within the party**, of the whole of Stalin's apparatus of secret repression which is beginning to function.

The organizational measure against Rykov was only the beginning of this attack. The TASS agency reports that Tomsky, Dogadov and Ossinsky have been relieved of their functions as vice-presidents of the Supreme Council of National Economy of the U. S. S. R.

Why Stalin Dumps the Right

Why does Stalin find the moment propitious to rid himself of the Right wing? What is the political significance of the attack launched by Stalin against the Right? The **Bulletin of the Russian Opposition** which has just appeared writes in an article on the campaign against the Right: "Just as the smashing of the Left Opposition at the Fifteenth Congress in December 1927 immediately preceded the Left turn, which officially opened on February 15, 1928, so the inevitable turn to the Right will have to be preceded by an organizational smashing of the Right Opposition. Why? Because if this turn should be made with the cause if this turn should be made with the presence of the Rights in the Central Committee, the latter would declare their solidarity with the turn, and by that, would not only make their expulsion from the party difficult but in general would additionally marr the perfection of the general line." (Militant, January 1, 1931.)

The symptoms that proclaim the turn to the Right in economic policy and, later on, in the whole policy of the Comintern, symptoms which we have signalled on the occasion of the last capitulation of Bucharin, is making itself manifest today in a clear manner. Centrism remains faithful to itself, to its own nature. After having taken adventurist flights in economic policy (the five year plan in four years and complete collectivization), Stalin could no longer come to a timely halt, and adapt the development of production to the real forces of the country, as comrade Trotsky counselled in his articles and comrades Rakovsky, Muralov and others in their declarations of April and to the Sixteenth Congress. Today, so as not to end in ruin, Centrism is obliged to make its customary brusk change in the opposite direction by resorting to the Right. But in order at the same time to save, as comrade Trotsky says, the "perfection" and the "prestige" of his general line, Stalin continues to employ the same perfidious manoeuver which consists of ideologically stripping his adversary after having destroyed him by apparatus measures.

An Open Secret

This game is effective and capable of lulling the masses so long as it is not unmasked, so long as the marked cards are not uncovered. Today, the Stalinist tactic has become an open secret. Inside the party, among the working masses, in the factories, they speak openly and translate into workers' language the perfidious malice of the "gensek" (general secretary). The bourgeoisie too, is beginning to disclose the combination and is already calculating the profits it can draw from it. The petty bourgeois journalists of the capitalist press are already announcing the radical change to the Right of the one they call with unacknowledged admiration "the flexible Georgian". Also the correspondent of the London **Sunday Times** telegraphs from Moscow in joyous accents: "The necessity of trimming the sails to the Right has now become urgent: Rykov, Tomsky and the others are withdrawn so as to give Stalin the possibility of realizing **by himself**, wholly or partially, the program of the Right opposition."

This new administrative change of Stalin has two aspects: he liquidates the representatives of the Right in the Soviet institutions in the person of Rykov, Tomsky and others, and rids the Communist International of the outstanding representatives of the "third period" in the person of Molotov. The aim is always the same: the methodical preparation of the turn to the Right on a national and international scale. The correspondents of the **Bulletin of the Russian Opposition** stress that for a certain time already the relations between Stalin and Molotov have become "spoiled". Stalin was very much dissatisfied with Molotov's policy in the C. I. and accused him . . . of having invented the "third period" and of having led the C. I. to its decline. It is not difficult to foresee that "the best disciple of Lenin and the chief of the world proletariat" (see the pamphlet on the fiftieth anniversary of Stalin and the preface to it) will unload all the ultra-Leftist mistakes he committed with Molotov in the Comintern upon the latter, and the Soviet press will undertake to make the new president of the People's Commissars understand that he will remain alone in bearing the responsibility for the policy, consistent in its stupidity, of the "third period". For the high post of President of the People's Commissars of the U. S. S. R., after the luckless experience of Rykov, will not for a moment hinder the Stalinist apparatus from treating the head of the Soviet government with every name in order to safegnard the prestige of the general secretary of the party.

New Right-Center Bloc?

Who is going to lead the Comintern now in Molotov's place? The return of Bucharin to the leading circles of the C. I. is spoken of. A new Stalin-Bucharin bloc, then, is being realized. The personal combination is of little import, it is the tendency of a similar bloc that seems possible to us. But the objective conditions of the U. S. S. R. have changed considerably since 1925-27. The Thermidorian elements are more numerous and bolder than before. They can interpret this new turn to the Right as an encouragement to the liquidation of all the institutions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There is no doubt that they will try to put over their work under cover of the new Centrist zig-zag. The Left Opposition warns the Centrist leadership against this danger. The possibilities of maneuvering between the Left and the Right become ever more restricted. The Stalinist leadership will be compelled by advancing events to choose between the Leninist positions of the Left Opposition or the complete discreditment of its "prestige" and the conquests of the October revolution. —M. MILL.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The following donations have been received by the **Militant** since December 15. We know that our members and sympathizers can do much better than this and we hope that the next list will show improvement. Those who are not in position to give much of their time to the organization should tax themselves from ten to twenty-five per cent of their weekly income and send in their contributions regularly. An increase in the income will mean an immediate increase in the literature output, and a return to a weekly paper. How much can you pledge weekly?

New York Branch	$82.00
Chicago Branch	21.00
Helen Judd, Chicago	50.00
Kansas City Branch.....	30.00
N. Berman, N. Y. C.	35.00
A. Glotzer, N. Y. C.	10.00
M. Lewit	10.50
H. Stone, N. Y. C.	5.00
M. Sterling, N. Y. C.	3.00
P. Koeppel, N. Y. C.	3.00
A. C. Miller, Williston, N. D.	8.00
Blecher, N. Y.	1.00
I. Gitlin, Newark, N. J.	5.00
Anonymous, Cambridge, Mass.	2.00
Wm. Peterson, St. Paul	3.00
L.Shafron, Sharon, Pa.	3.00
Anonymous, N. Y. C.	.50
Anonymous, Brooklyn	1.00
Vincent Dunne, Minneapolis	6.00
D. Plarinos, Youngstown, O. for C. C. Chelot, S. Frank..	6.00
Lucas Basky, Palisades, N. J.	1.00
Frank Basky, L. I. City....	1.00
Louis Weserk, Chicago	1.00
A. Cohen, Baltimore	3.00
R. N. Davis, Pittsburgh Pa...	1.00
Anonymous Minneapolis.....	3.00
Sue Weeks, Paterson, N. J...	1.00
Jos. Keller, Cleveland, O...	1.00
R.Hegedus, So. Bend, Ind. ..	1.00
Geo. Roberts, St. Louis Mo.	3.00
Anonymous, Minneapolis ...	1.00
Rose Powell, Richmond, Calif.	2.00
A. Friend, Newrak N. J.....	3.00
C. Cheskis, Boston, Mass....	2.00
Jas. Sifakis, Pittsburgh, Pa..	3.00

The Sponsor Plan

Did you read "The Turn in the Communist International and The Situation in Germany" by Leon Trotsky? Also "The Strategy of the World Revolution" by Leon Trotsky? If you have, you undoubtedly noticed in the foreword an acknowledgment to those comrades who made the printing of these two pamphlets possible. That is what we call the sponsor plan. One or more comrades get together and contribute in advance the cost of printing a pamphlet. We print it and distribute it through our organization, reaching out to as many class conscious workers as we can possibly reach.

Just at this writing we have ready for printing the next pamphlet by Trotsky, "Unemployment and the Five Year Plan." But we have no sponsors for it as yet.

Branches and Individuals who can undertake the sponsorship of "Unemployment and the Five Year Plan" are strongly urged to communicate with the national office **at once.**

Next in order of publication will be "Syndicalism and Communism" a pamphlet, and "The Permanent Revolution" a book, both by comrade Trotsky. Sponsors are wanted for all of these.

INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN OF THE LEFT OPPOSITION COMING OUT IN ENGLISH

The International Bulletin of the Left Opposition, published by the International Secretariat of the Opposition at Paris, is soon to appear in a complete English edition. Hitherto, the Bulletin has been published in the French and German languages, which has made it inaccessible to many comrades in this and other countries. By a decision of the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition), the Bulletin is now coming out in English as well.

The first number of the English edition will be a double number, publishing **all** the material that appeared in Nos. 1 and 2 of the Paris edition. The complete contents have been translated and the Bulletin will be ready for distribution in a very few days. It will contain highly important articles on the position of the various groups of the Left Opposition throughout the world. It has the first manifesto of the Paris International Conference, articles on the movement in France, Germany, Belgium, China, Bulgaria, Greece, Austria, etc., etc. It is invaluable for a knowledge of the Opposition movement and should be in the hands of every class conscious militant.

The English edition will sell for 10 cents a copy, postpaid, and 7 cents in bundles of five or more. Since only a limited amount are being issued, all comrades are urgently requested to send in their orders immediately so as to insure delivery in time. Orders and funds should be forwarded directly to **The Militant,** 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

HAVE YOU THESE MISSING COPIES?

The National Office is anxious to bind the past three years of the **Militant** so that they can be had in a permanent form. Unfortunately, our files have been depleted, particularly of some issues. In order to bind them, we must have an additional amount of two copies especially: Vol. I, No. 1, of November 15, 1928, and Vol. II, No. 4, of February 15, 1929. Comrades who have these on hand are urgently requested to forward them to us immediately.

IN ENGLISH **IN GERMAN**

"THE TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION"

By Leon Trotsky

A penetrating examination of the displacements in the relationships of social forces evidenced by the recent elections in Germany the meaning of the sensational Fascist victory, its connection with the new policy of the Stalinist apparatus, and a proposal for action and perspective for the Communists. The edition, printed only a few weeks ago, is almost exhausted. Quick response will bring your copy immediately—in English or German, at the same price: 10 cents each or 7 cents in bundle order rates.

Order from
THE MILITANT
84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

AARON GROSS

On Saturday, January 3, 1931, Aaron Gross, one of the well-known leaders of the Left wing and Communist movement in the needle trades, died of heart failure, at the age of 38. Born in Poland, he came to the United States shortly before the war and became active in the needle trades union. Later on, he joined the Communist Party and was prominently identified with the Left wing movement in the needle trades, and particularly in the International Fur Workers Union of which he became vice-president. He was at the head of the famous furriers' strike of 1926 which the Left wing led and which brought the conflict between it and the Right wing bureaucracy to a sharp point. It was during the strike of 1927 that Gross was savagely assaulted by Right wing gangsters who cut him so seriously with knives that his life was in danger for a while. The injuries he suffered at that time contributed to a large extent to the illness which compelled him to depart for Los Angeles a while ago in an endeavor to recover his health. His death came suddenly. He leaves a wife, Sarah, and two sons, Morris and Arthur.

During his years in the party, comrade Gross was always associated with the Lovestone group in general and with the Zimmerman-Wortis-Gold faction of opportunists in the needle trades in particular. A devoted, energetic and courageous worker in the movement, he was nevertheless always on that side of the struggle in the Left wing which opposed the adoption and execution of a genuinely Communist course. Like many of his intimate collaborators in the Left wing, and later in the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, he was subsequently made one of the scapegoats for the whole past policy of the party in the needle trades upon the advent of the recent ultra-Leftist course. He was expelled from the party together with other supporters of the Right wing faction. He did not live to see the consummation of the bloc between his party fraction and a section of the trade union bureaucracy against whom he helped lead the needle trades workers in some of their most brilliant batales. . . .

Though we were on opposite sides of the struggle in the Communist movement, the Left Opposition bows in tribute before this fallen fighter who rose from the many-thousand ranks of the bitterly exploited needle trades workers and helped in their heroic upward struggle to freedom.

The Relapse into Trotskyism

(Continued from page 1)

to entrust him in any case with leading work." So much for the information of our trustworthy men who are absolutely sure.

Who Teaches Leninism

A certain Shandums has come upon the scene in recent times as a big figure (right now he is a member of the Central Control Commission of the party, responsible director of the department of cotton).

He fulminates against all the deviations and passes for one of the defenders of "Leninism" (see **Pravda** of December 14). A few words to characterize him: in 1927, he was an adherent of the Left Opposition. Member of the Central Committee of the Armenian party, he was unmasked by the Stalinists. This hero became frightened and renounced all his ideas. But that is not all. The next day he was pressed to the wall by the workers' nucleus to which he belonged and which followed the Left Opposition. To the question: "Why didn't you defend your conceptions in the Central Committee," this fabulous hero replied: "I fooled them in the Central Committee, my soul belongs to you." And this individual is today one of the pillars of "genuine Leninism". It is an eloquent fact that it is such wretched creatures who are educating the new generation in the spirit of loyalty, courage and militancy. At the same time, the best revolutionists are perishing in exile. ZINZADZE IS DEAD! This organizer of the civil war in the Caucasus, president of the Caucasian G. P. U., member of the party since 1903 who helped to crush the Menshevik insurrection of 1924, imprisoned for years by czarism, escaped from Menshevik prisons in 1920, in short, one of the exemplary and most courageous chiefs of the old Bolshevik party dies in exile, and **Pravda** has not a word for him except for a farewell of his wife and children. These facts must be explained to the party members. The struggle must be carried on with them against the Stalinist régime which does nothing but weaken the resistance of the party and endanger the Soviet power.

—SENINE.

THE MILITANT, Vol. IV, No. 2, Jan.15 1931. Published twice monthly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 E. 10th St., New York N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $250. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shactman, Maurice Spector Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879 (Total No. 61)

In the International

«Austro-Oppositionism»

The Austrian Opposition movement is certainly not lacking in surprises. Unfortunately, these surprises are rarely rejoicing. At the very moment when, after two years of efforts to overcome incredibly petty and unprincipled quarrels the question of creating a united section of the international Left Opposition assumed concrete forms in Austria and the International Bureau began to elaborate its concrete proposals, the leadership of the Austrian Communist Party (Opposition) announces in a letter signed by Frey and 16 other comrades, their formal withdrawal from the International Left Opposition. The declaration is formulated to these words:

"To the International Secretariat of the Left Opposition, Paris:

"Since their visit to Vienna, we announced to comrades Molinier and Mille that while being in **political agreement**—this political agreement still exists now—we have for some time considered with growing doubt and without confidence **the false and dishonest organizational methods** which comrade Trotsky and the International Secretariat employ in practise.

"We hoped that this would be changed after the impressions comrades Mille and Molinier obtained in Austria. But we have been greatly deceived. The letter of comrade Mille of November 12, and above all, that of comrade Trotsky of November 16, 1930, as well as the supplements it contained, have **deprived us of the last bit of confidence.**

"Consequently, **we formally withdraw our adherence to the International Left Opposition.**

"A supplement on the decision on the expulsion of Stift is enclosed.

"The above letter was adopted by the unanimous decision of the Opposition leadership.

The letter speaks of false and dishonest (that is, anti-Communist) organizational methods of the International Opposition, and above all of its secretariat and comrade Trotsky. The lightness and unspeakable lack of scruple of this accusation which requires no comment for any serious Left Communist, are shown by the fact alone that the accusers are in no position to give their estimate a precise political expression, based on facts and couched in Communist language. They resort to diplomatic figures, speaking of "growing doubts", "confidence", "personal impressions" and the like. Instead of answering for their charges before the international tribunal, they reveal themselves in a ridiculous and shameful manner. Certainly **these** are not the methods of the International Left Opposition.

It is not the first time that Frey (we speak of him as the representative of the administration of the A. C. P. [Opposition], believes he must feel himself greatly deceived." From the very beginning, Frey gave his adherence and his "confidence" to the International Opposition on the sole condition that the latter express **a priori** its confidence in his organization and his whole past activity, and that it proscribe all the other Austrian Opposition groups, with which Frey had had or still has more or less important differences — differences which, in any case, have no importance now for the International Opposition. On this question, there was an exchange of letters between comrade Trotsky and Frey and his friends which lasted for months, in which comrade Trotsky, given the absence of any programmatic or tactical divergences, recommended a broad unity move on the basis of a common platform, as the only possibility of rallying in a revolutionary manner the Left Communist elements. The conclusions drawn by Frey, at various periods in the correspondence, were rich in changes as to his formal attitude towards the International Opposition.

In September 1929, he declared that he wanted to retain a "free hand" towards the International Opposition and to remain a "sympathizing" member. In April 1930, refused to participate in the International he had to "settle" the "disputes" in question with the Russian Opposition. After the "final" formal adherence, he again played (during the sojourn of the French comrades in Vienna) with the idea of resigning, in order to preserve "elbow room" for "settling" the nasty Austrian affairs. Now he takes refuge in abandoning the "last bit of confidence". This puerile and formalistic hocus-pocus can only arouse astonishment and regret. But if one considers further the obstinate refusal to collaborate actively in the international work, one concludes that Frey, by now occupying the position of national-Communism, only quits the position of a **fictitious internationalism.** He does not see in his adherence to the International Left Opposition the consequence of a community of action and program, but a formal organizational maneuver useful for covering up private factional interests. So that we see in Austria a very unedifying spectacle where, in alternating cycles, one of the Left Oppostion groups makes the best of its solidarity with the International Opposition while it hopes thereby to hit a blow at the other group.

As to the letter of comrade Trotsky, including the supplements of November 16, it doubtlessly concerns the copy of a letter from comrade Trotsky sent to the administration of the A. C. P. (Opposition) and addressed to Stift and four other comrades expelled from the A. C. P. (O.) following upon internal disputes in which, considering themselves as expelled, these comrades continued to call themselves members of the International Opposition and partisans of any movement for Austrian unity, and had appealed to the International Bureau. Without desiring to anticipate the formal decision of the International Bureau or expressing any final opinion on the differences (considering that some had attributed capitulationist tendencies to these comrades), comrade Trotsky, in a most cautious manner, had admitted the possibility of modifying the internal régime of the Austrian Opposition. (Moreover, for the united Opposition which was to be formed, he had made **quite precise proposals as to the internal régime and the relations with the International Opposition.)**

It seems that these doubts, which comrade Trotsky expressed in a very prudent manner, concerning the organizational methods of the administration of the A. C. P. (O.) were enough for Frey to resume his old lamentations on the methods of Zinovlev-Bucharin-Stalin in the International Opposition and to take flight "formally". To call the International Left the "caricature of the Comintern" is the favorite method of the Brandler-Neuraths, who have created a caricacure of the pre-war International under the form of a flexible union of the various national currents who are greatly concerned about their own "autonomy". Frey, on his part, demands for the A. C. P. (O.) more than "autonomy"—the complete "non-intervention" of the International, exclusively under the form of an unretricted sanctioning of all his measures. Obviously these are not the methods of the International Left.

In Austria, considerable sections of the present Oppositionist groupings (above all the group around Frey) were at one time (since 1922) already engaged within the party in violent and ceaseless faction fights which, while being objectively the expression of the regroupings in the Communist camp, nevertheless revolved around specifically Austrian questions. The traditions of the old factional groupings are today still the basis of the internal friction of the Austrian Opposition movement and have given birth to a species of Austro-oppositionism, the principal character of which is the lack of international orientation based upon very marked fractional principles and pettiness, which is well illustrated by the resignation of the administration of the A. C. P. (O.) which came in 24 hours. But Frey and his comrades are not the only ones in this case: the Mahnruf group which, not without internal obstacles, declared its adherence to the International Opposition, has not yet come to the point of translating it in its journal, which does not appear as the organ of the Left Opposition but as the "organ of the workers' struggle"

Frey and his comrades, in quitting, say at the same time that they are politically in complete agreement with the International Left. They believe it possible to substitute for the community of struggle with the **Left, which is** indissolubly bound up with its program and its activity, the isolated existence in one country. In other words, they want to put a national-socialist basis under the revolutionary program of the Left Isn't it absurd to speak in such a case of political agreement? No, the International Left Opposition has nothing in common with this opportunism.

The document underlines the unanmity of the decision. It is sad that among the leading comrades nobody opposed this clear turn to nationalist Austro-oppositionism. Thus, one can only hope that the worker-members of the A. C. P. (O.) will know how to defend internationalism against Austrian provincialism.

—JAN FRANKEL.

Julio A. Mella

This January tenth is the second anniversary of the death in Mexico City of comrade Julio Antonio Mella, assassinated by hirelings of the Machado régime in Cuba. With Mella's death the Latin-American and world Communist movement lost one of its ablest and most devoted fighters. The murder was only one of a long series committed by the Wall Street-supported Cuban dictator on the persons of working class leaders. Too numerous even to mention have been the Communist party members and leaders and the militant trade unionists assassinated by the "tropical Mussolini" in his attempt to impede the growth of a strong working class movement capable of overthrowing what is doubtless the most odious of all the puppet régimes of Latin-America. Assassinated on the streets, tortured to death in their cells, fed to the sharks of Havana Bay, massacred in the streets, the number of Cuban revolutionists murdered in this struggle is already legion and the total continues to mount under the pressure of the general industrial crisis and general mass discontent on the island.

For a number of years comrade Mella was the outstanding leader of the Cuban movement. Even in his student days, he distinguished himself notably for his educational activities among the Havana workers with the organization of the "Universidad Popular—José Marti", and for his leadership in a number of student movements, so intense in their agitation against the Machado régime, that Machado had to close the National University in 1925.

Exiled from Cuba

Julio Mella, together with a number of other comrades, mostly Communists was framed up by the Havana police in a supposed "bomb plot". They were held illegally without trial for some time in spite of the efforts of the workers and students to have them freed. Finally, through a 19 day hunger strike, which brought about a continent-wide protest movement, Mella's liberty was granted on condition that he immediately leave the country. He was sent to Honduras, from which county he was deported to Guatemala and then re-deported to Mexico. The Mexican government of Calles, at that time posing as an anti-imperialist government, offered him asylum.

In Mexico, in spite of continual disagreements with the opportunist heads of the Mexican party, Mella soon became one of the outstanding leaders. Because of instructions, the Mexican party practically compelled Mella, as well as many other foreign comrades, to dedicate themselves to anti-imperialist work almost exclusively. Mella was for a considerable period general secretary of the Continental Secretariat of the All America Anti-Imperialist League, and in this manner his energies were to a great extent side-tracked from the fields where he would have been most useful to the movement. Later, however, for a period in 1928, Mella occupied provisionally the general secretaryship of the C. P. of Mexico. But upon the return of the delegation from Moscow after the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern, comrade Mella was not only removed from this provisional post but was also summarily removed from the Central Committee, upon the insistence of the right wing C. E. C. led by Martin (Stirner) and Carrillo. In a former period Mella had been accused of "Trotskyism", and only through a formal renunciation of the point of view of the Left Opposition which was probably the greatest political mistake of his party career, was he allowed to remain in the leadership.

At the time of Mella's occupancy of the general secretaryship, the C. E. C. for the first time discussed seriously a definite break with the national bourgeoisie. During the whole past period, the orientation of the party on trade union questions had continually been towards work within the CROM, and in an "autonomous" sense only insomuch as a close collaboration with "progressive" state governors made this possible.

At the time of the breakdown of the CROM, when whole labor federations of states and of trades, (Puebla, printing trades, etc.) were declaring themselves independent of the reformist center under the Left slogan of "against the bureaucracy," etc., the convocation of a unity conference of the autonomous unions became quite opportune. Such a step, if taken at the right time, would have served to separate not only "our own" unions of Jalisco, Tamaulipas, etc., from the local politicians, but also would have prevented the Obregonists from establishing their hegemony over the organizations recently rebelled from the CROM.

Mella against the Right Wing

At this time it was inevitable that large sections should reorientate themselves on this question, and comrade Julio Mella was among the first to come forward in the Mexico City branch in support of the calling of a trade union unity conference for the formation of a new center. For this reason, and through a revival of the old "Trotskyist" accusations, the Right wingers denounced him as disloyal and he was removed from the C. E. C.

In September 1928, an emergency conference of the party was called to discuss the change in the political situation. At this conference, Martin demanded the expulsion of Mella for the crime of working against the party line in the direction of "dual unionism." The Right wing proposed a united front with the reformists against the Obregonists (and Left wing CROM members) who were splitting the unions. But instead of Mella being expelled from the party at that time, he was successful, together with the Mexico City delegation, in rallying the whole conference, with one exception, to a struggle against the opportunist tail-endism of the Central Committee. This is not the time and place to discuss at length the manner in which the C. E. C., still dominated by the Right wing, carried out the decisions of the September 1928 conference. From a policy of sabotaging the decisions they soon flopped over, under the influence of the new winds from Moscow, to an adventurist sectarian opsition. Lack of mobility in the most opportune moment, and lack of serious organization afterwards, wrecked from the start what might have become under a more able leadership, the greatest force in the Mexican labor movement.

Much of Julio Mella's activity while in Mexico was wrapped up in the organization known as the ANERC (Association of New Revolutionary Emigrés from Cuba) and the publication of its **Cuba Libre** (Free Cuba). Numerous differences arose between the comrades of the Communist fraction of the ANERC in Mexico and the C. E. C. of the C. P. of Mexico, and the relations between Mella and the party leadership became exceedingly tense towards the end of 1928. In the very last days of the year, barely two weeks before his assassination by the agents of President Machado, comrade Julio Mella was expelled from the party by the decision of the C. E. C. They had taken advantage of a very rash letter in which he had declared his inability to collaborate with the party leadership, tendering his resignation. No excuses for this great mistake on Mella's part can be made but it goes without saying that the C. .E C. adopted anything but the correct attitude when he was so summarily expelled. One week later, that is about January 3, 1929, Mella requested a reconsideration, making a complete recognition of this error on his part. It was decided to reinstate him in the party, with the stipulation that he was to hold no posts of responsibility for a period of three years. On January 10th he was shot dead in the street by Machado's assasins. . . .

—RUSSELL BLACKWELL.

DEBATE

"IS THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP NECESSARY?"

James P. Cannon
Communist League of America
says, YES!

Walter Starrett
"Road to Freedom"
says, NO!

at the
LABOR TEMPLE
14th Street and Second Avenue
on
SATURDAY, EEBRUARY 14, 1931

Admission: 35 Cents **8 P. M. sharp**

AUSPICES: JOINT ARRANGEMENTS COMFITTEE.

THE CLASS IN MARXIAN ECONOMICS

Our class in Marxian Economics has been reorganized, with comrade Arne Swabeck (recently arrived from Chicago) as instructor.

This class, sponsored by the Communist League of America (Opposition) N. Y. branch, is open to all class conscious workers desirous of obtaining a serious and correct Marxist education. A method of student initiative is being pursued.

All workers interested in taking the course communicate with the local office, 84 East 10th Street.

Thermidorianism and Bonapartism

By LEON TROTSKY

Historical analogies must be dealt with ably, otherwise they are easily converted into metaphysical abstractions and do not help the orientation but, on the contrary, lead one astray.

Some comrades in the ranks of the Opposition abroad see a contradiction in the fact that we sometimes speak of the **Thermidorian** tendencies and forces in the Soviet Union and sometimes of the **Bonapartist** features of the régime in the C. P. S. U., and they even draw the conclusion that we have revised our evaluation of the Soviet state. This is a mistake. It flows from the fact that these comrades conceive the historical terms (Thermidorianism, Bonapartism) as abstract categories and not as living, that is, contradictory processes.

A successful socialist construction is developing in the U. S. S. R. But this process advances in an extremely contradictory manner: and because of capitalist encirclement, the counter-action of the internal anti-proletarian forces and the incorrect policy of the leadership, it fails under the influence of hostile forces.

Can the contradictions of socialist construction, generally speaking, reach a degree of tension under which they would blow up the basis of socialist construction laid by the October revolution and strengthened by the subsequent economic successes, particularly by the successes of the Five Year Plan? They can.

Possible Successors to Soviet Rule

Under such a condition, what would come as a substitute for the present Soviet society taken in its entirety (economy, classes, state, party)?

The present regime, a transition from capitalism to socialism, could give way only to capitalism under the condition mentioned above. It would be a capitalism saturated with contradictions which exclude the possibility of its progressive development. Because all these contradictions which, according to our hypothesis, might bring about the blowing up of the Soviet régime, would immediately reconstitute themselves into internal contradictions of the capitalist régime, they would very soon acquire even greater acuteness. This means that inside of the capitalist counter-revolution there would be the elements of the new October revolution.

The state is a superstructure. To consider it independent of the character of the productive relations and the forms of ownership (as Urbahns, for instance, does in relation to the Soviet state) means to renounce the foundation of Marxism. But the state no more than the party is a passive superstructure. Under the influence of the convulsions emanating from the class basis of society, new processes occur in the state and party superstructure which—within certain limits—have an independent character, and when combined with the processes of the economic foundation itself, may acquire a decisive significance for the class nature of the whole régime, turning developments in one or the other direction for a considerable period.

It would be the worst form of doctrinarism, "Urbahnsism" turned inside out, to consider that the fact of the nationalization of industry, supplemented by the high tempo of development, in themselves assure an uninterrupted development to socialism, regardless of the processes in the party and the state. To think this means not to understand the functions of the party, its double and treble function in the **only** country of the proletarian dictatorship, at that an economically **backward** country. If we assume for a moment that those in charge of industry, on the one hand, and the leading strata of the workers, on the other, break loose from party discipline, which is fused with that of the state, then the road to socialism will be blocked: nationalized industry would begin to be differentiated between the struggling groups, the conflicts between the trust administration and the workers would begin to assume an open character, the trusts would acquire an ever greater independence, the beginnings made in planning would naturally be reduced to zero, dragging along with them the monopoly of foreign trade as well. All these processes leading to capitalism would inevitably amount to the crushing of the proletarian dictatorship.

Does the present party régime, in spite of economic successes, threaten the party with the disintegration of bonds and discipline? Undoubtedly. To underestimate the dangers of the decay of the party and state fabric, because of the economic successes, would be criminal. The party, as a party, does **not even exist today.** The Centrist apparatus has strangled it. But the Left Opposition, which the Centrist apparatus fears like fire, and under whose lash it performs its zig-zags, does exist. It is precisely this correlation between the Left Opposition and the Centrist apparatus that is a substitute for the party and keeps the Rights in check.

Even with a complete and open disruption of party bonds, the party will not disappear. Not because there is an apparatus: it will be the first victim of its own crimes—but because there is a Left Opposition. Whoever does not understand this, understands nothing.

But what we are considering now is not how and by what paths the Opposition can fulfill its basic task: to help the proletarian vanguard bar the counter-revolution from the socialist development. Hypothetically, we will make our point of departure the assumption that we did not succeed in this, so as to picture to ourselves more concretely the historical consequences of such failure.

The smashing of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as we have already said, could mean nothing but the restoration of capitalism. But the political forms in which this restoration would take place, how these forms would alternate and how they would combine—that is an independent and complicated question.

It is clear that only sightless persons could think that the rebirth of compradore capitalism is compatible with "democracy". To anyone who can see, it is clear that a democratic counter-revolution is excluded. But the concrete question of the possible political forms of the counter-revolution admits only of a conditional answer.

Thermidor: in France and Russia

When the Opposition spoke of the Thermidorian danger, it had in mind primarily the very important and considerable process within the party: the growth of the stratum of Bolsheviks who have separated themselves from the mass, who feel secure, who have connected themselves with non-proletarian circles and are satisfied with their social condition, analogous to the stratum of bloated Jacobins who became, in part, the supports, and primarily the executive apparatus of the Thermidorian overturn in 1794, paving the road in this way for Bonapartism. Analyzing the processes of the Thermidorian degeneration in the party, the Opposition was far from saying that the counter-revolutionary overturn, were it to occur, would necessarily have to assume the form of a Thermidor, that is, of a more or less lasting domination of the bourgeoisified Bolsheviks, with the formal retention of the Soviet system—similar to the retention of the Convention by the Thermidorians. History never repeats itself, particularly when there is such a profound difference in class basis.

The French Thermidor had as a foundation in the contradictions of the Jacobin régime. But these very contradictions were also the foundation of Bonapartism, that is, the régime of the military-bureaucratic dictatorship, which the bourgeoisie tolerated over itself so that, under cover of it, it could all the more securely take over the domination of society. In the Jacobin dictatorship, there were already included all the elements of Bonapartism even though they are found there in an undeveloped form, particularly the struggle with the **sans-culotte** elements of the régime. The Thermidor became a necessary preparatory stage toward Bonapartism and that is all. It is not accidental that Bonaparte created the bureaucracy of the Empire out of the Jacobin bureaucracy.

Revealing in the present Stalinist régime the elements of Thermidor and the elements of Bonapartism, we are far from falling into a contradiction, as is thought by those to whom Thermidorianism and Bonapartism represent abstractions and not living tendencies, one growing over into the other.

What state form would be assumed by a counter-revolutionary overthrow in Russia were it to succeed (and that is far from being so simple) depends upon the combination of a number of concrete factors, in the first place on the degree of acuteness reached by the economic contradictions at the moment, on the correlation of the capitalist and socialist elements in economy; further, on the correlation of the proletarian Bolsheviks and the bourgeois "Bolsheviks", on the groupings of forces within the army; finally, on the specific gravity and character of the foreign intervention. At any rate, it would be the sheerest absurdity to think that a counter-revolutionary régime must necessarily go through the stages of the Directorate, the Consulate and the Empire in order to be capped by a restoration of czarism. But no matter what the counter-revolutionary régime might be, the Thermidorian and Bonapartist elements, at any rate, would find their place in it, a bigger or smaller rôle would be played by the Bolshevik-Soviet bureaucracy, civil and military, and at the same time the régime itself would be the dictatorship of the sword over society in the interests of the bourgeoisie and against the people. This is why it is so important at present to follow how these elements and tendencies are being formed in the womb of the official party, which, under all conditions, remains **the laboratory of the future;** that is, under the condition of an uninterrupted socialist development as well as under the condition of a counter-revolutionary break.

Does what was said above mean that we identify the Stalinist régime with the régime of Robespierre? **No,** we are as far from vulgar analogies in relation to the present as we are in relation to the possible or probable future. From the standpoint of the question that interests us, the essence of Robespierre's policy consisted of an ever greater accentuation of the struggle on two fronts: against the **sans-culottes,** that is, the propertyless, as well as against the rotten "degenerates", that is, the Jacobin bourgeoisie. Robespierre conducted a policy of a petty bourgeois, attempting to elevate himself to the absolute ruler. Hence the struggle against the Left and against the Right. A proletarian revolutionist may also be compelled to conduct a struggle on two fronts, but only **episodically.** His basic struggle is the one against the bourgeoisie: class against class. But petty bourgeois revolutionists, even in the epoch of their historical apogee, have always and unalterably been compelled to conduct a struggle on two fronts. This is what brought about the gradual strangulation of the Jacobin party, the mortification of the Jacobin clubs, the bureaucratization of the revolutionary terror, that is, to the self-isolation of Robespierre which made it possible for the bloc of his Right and Left enemies to remove him so easily.

Differences and Similarities

The features of similarity with the Stalinist régime are very conspicuous here. But the differences are profounder than the similarities. Robespierre's historic service consisted of his merciless purging of society of the feudal rubbish: but in the face of the future society, Robespierre was powerless. The proletariat as a class was nonexistent, socialism could have had only a utopian character. The only real perspective could be the perspective of bourgeois development. The fall of the Jacobin régime was unavoidable.

The Lefts of those days, basing themselves on the **sans-culottes,** the propertyless plebeians—a very insecure prop!—could not have their independent road. By this, the bloc with the Rights was predetermined, just as in the end the supporters of Robespierre, in the vast majority, supported the Rights in the future. This was the political expression of the victory of [illegible] development over the pretensions of the petty bourgeoisie and the revolutionary spurts of the plebeians.

It is needless to say that Stalin has no basis for claims to Robespierre's services; the purging of Russia from feudal rubbish and the crushing of the restorationist attempts were quite completed in the Leninist period. Stalinism grew out of a break with Leninism. But this break was never complete, nor is it now. Stalin carries on not an episodic, but a permanent, systematic, organic struggle on two fronts. This is an innate feature of a petty bourgeois policy. At the Right of Stalin—the unconscious and conscious capitalist restorationists in different stages. To the Left—the proletarian Opposition. This diagnosis has been tested in the fire of world events. Strangulation of the party by the apparatus is called forth not by the necessity of a struggle against the bourgeois restoration—on the contrary, this struggle demands the greatest activity and alertness on the part of the party—but by a struggle against the Left; to put it more precisely, by the necessity for the apparatus to liberate itself for constant maneuvering between the Rights and the Lefts. Here we have a similarity with Robespierre. Here are the roots upon which were nourished the Bonapartist features of his ruin. But Robespierre had no choice. His zig-zags denoted the convulsions of the Jacobin régime.

Is a consistent revolutionary policy in the Soviet Union conceivable or inconceivable at present—on a proletarian basis which Robespierre did not have? And if it is conceivable, can it be calculated that this policy will be supported early enough by a revolution in other countries? Upon the reply to these two questions depends the evaluation of the perspective of the struggle of the antagonistic tendencies in the economy as well as in the politics of the Soviet Union. To both of these questions, we Bolshevik-Leninists reply in the affirmative and will continue to reply in the affirmative—so long as history does not show the contrary by facts and events, that is, by a merciless life and death struggle.

In this and only this way can the problem arise for revolutionists who feel themselves to be the live forces in the process, in distinction from doctrinaries who observe the processes from the sidelines and dismember it into lifeless categories.

We expect to return to this question in another connection in the coming number. Here we only wished to sweep away the grossest and most dangerous misunderstandings. The Left Opposition, at any rate, has no reason for revising its basis so long as this revision is not placed on the order of the day by great historical events.

Exit Weisbord. . .

As our readers know, Albert Weisbord, who was expelled from the party about a year ago, made certain approaches in recent months to the Left Opposition, and at times even represented himself as a supporter of our principled standpoint. Those who have read his statements and our replies which we published in the **Militant** for the information of our readers, already know that on a number of the most important questions he was separated from us by a wide gulf. We pointed this out in our comments on his declaration of last fall and again on his proposals for an unemployment program.

As his various statements showed, his political line in general represented an attempt to substitute for the principle line of the Left Opposition, on nearly all the main questions, a melange of opportunism and confusion borrowed in part from the Right wing and in part from the Centrists. It was this conflict in principle between his line and ours which obliged the National Committee of the League to reject his application for membership. Upon his failure to gain admission into the Communist League, Weisbord then made an alternative proposal to collaborate with us in certain phases of our activity until such time as political accord would make his membership possible.

He represented himself as sympathetic to our movement and anxious to work in our direction. Taking his representations in good faith, the National Committee decided to accept his offer of collaboration and assigned him to conduct a class in Marxian economics in our school. In this capacity, Weisbord was not long in demonstrating that he had by no means freed himself of the Pepperistic conception of politics in which he had received his party training. He undertook to organize a secret factional grouping in the Communist League on the opportunistic platform of a bloc between the Left Opposition and the Lovestone Right wing against the official party. After some weeks of these unprincipled maneuvers of Weisbord—reminiscent of the contemptible **methods of petty bourgeois politiciandom, with which the Pepper-Lovestone leaders poisoned the party life for so many years—** the National Committee decided to bring the whole question into the open through a principled discussion.

Accordingly, a meeting of the New York branch was devoted to a thorough consideration of the principle basis of the three factions in the Comintern and the fundamental line of the International Left Opposition, which excludes the possibility of any bloc with the Right wing. In this connection, the question of our perspectives and tasks as the Marxist wing of the movement were fully set forth. In order to give the members of the New York branch the full opportunity of contrasting the opportunist and the revolutionary points of view, the national committee took the responsibility for inviting Weisbord to attend the meeting and expound his standpoint. As a result of this discussion, the unprincipled faction maneuvers of Weisbord collapsed like a house of cards. A few of the younger comrades who had been temporarily influenced by Weisbord's prescription for a "simple" and "quick" road to a mass movement, were thereby enabled to arrive at a clearer judgment. In the end, Weisbord's opportunistic platform as well as his behind-the-scenes maneuvers to disrupt the Opposition, were repudiated.

The branch showed its complete solidarity with the line of the National Committee and declared itself in favor of a severance of all relations with Weisbord. This decision was formally made by the National Committee at its last meeeting.

The Weisbord incident, insignificant enough in itself, is of value in affording a contrast between the Pepperistic method of unprincipled faction fighting and the methods of the International Left Opposition. The latter welcomes all Communists who are attempting to break the unwholesome régime in the party and the Comintern and to seek their way to platform. We stand ready to assist them in every comradely way. But we will have nothing to do with those who try to smuggle into the Opposition the contraband platform of opportunism and the petty bourgeois methods that always accompany it. **The exit of Weisbord serves to give point to this principle of conduct.**

Lovestone Looks with Favor at the Socialist Party

By MAX SHACHTMAN

In the last issue of the **Militant**, we indicated by a number of indisputable facts the direction which the Lovestone Right wing is taking: away from Communism and towards the social democracy. The few days that have elapsed have only served to furnish additional, and even more striking confirmation of this statement. The additional material, furnished by Lovestone himself shows that the hypocritical claims that the Right wing is anxious to work together with the pseudo-progressives in a "trade union bloc" against reaction, are set up in reality in order to camouflage the rapidly developing **political bloc** of the Right wing and the social reformists aiming at the liquidation of the Communist movement and Communist influence in the working class.

ZIMMERMAN DISCOVERS THE VIRTUES OF LEVY

We have already revealed the "united front" which the Lovestone faction made with the Sigman henchman, Levy, in Local 1 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. At that time, we did not have at hand the official apologium of Lovestone. Its publication only makes the case worse for the Right wing. As was easy to foretell, the "bloc" met with the unconcealed hostility of the vast majority of the Communist and Left wing workers in the needle trades. Like Lovestone, they are thoroughly acquainted with Levy and his stripe. Levy was one of the outstanding leaders of the Right wing in expelling the Left wing workers from the I. L. G. W. U. a few years ago and thereby splitting the union in the interests of the bureaucracy and the manufacturers. Only the sheerest simpleton can regard this struggle as a "dispute" between "two sections of the labor movement." As every class conscious worker, at least, understands, it was a struggle between those elements representing the interests of the workers and those elements representing the interests of the capitalists. Levy, and his boss Sigman, was and remains a member of the latter "faction". That he is not disinclined to have himself called a "progressive" today and to oppose the dominant bureaucracy is attributable to two facts: the dispute between the Schlesinger clique in office and the Sigman clique out of office; the revival of the fighting moods among the militant workers who for a dozen reasons (which we shall not deal with here) have been driven into into the Right wing union again in the last couple of years.

The task of those who have at heart the interests of the Left wing and Communist movement (which are and must be identical with the interests of the working class as opposed to those of the bourgeoisie and its labor agents), is to reveal the mechanism which has actuated the Levys in the past and moves them to their "new" position today. For the Levys, large and small, represent an accidental, individual phenomenon, generally speaking, no "erring sinner who sees the light" but a distinct class influence in the labor movement. How do the Lovestoneites measure up to this task? By joining hands with Levy and using their own somewhat tarnished "Communist" reputation to give him what amounts to a clean bill of health. The leading Right wing opportunist, Zimmerman, who transferred his allegiance from the party to the Lovestone faction without disturbing his own equilibrium for a moment, lamely explains the shabby affair as follows:

"Their [i. e., Levy's] program is mildly progressive and on a number of questions unclear and confused. Some of the leaders of the Trade Union Center [the Levy group] have a bad record in the union because of their former support of the expulsion policy. But at the present time the Trade Union Center is carrying on a fight against the policies and régime of the reactionary administration of the union. At the present time these leaders claim [so!] that they recognize their mistakes and that they definitely and openly repudiate the expulsion policy." **(Rev. Age, No. 4.)**

It is not true that the "Trade Union Center is carrying on a fight against the policies and régime of the reactionary administration"; it is the channel through which the Sigman clique is fighting the Schlesinger clique, and the victory of the former would not result in a less reactionary administration at all. It is not true that the Levys recognize their "mistakes", nor that they make this "claim"; it is true that the Lovestone faction is deliberately adorning Levy in order to make him, and consequently the bloc, acceptable to the rank and file militants.

"It is clear for us," says the leaflet issued "independently" by the Lovestone group (and if we know the Lovestoneites, with the tacit consent of Levy), "that some of those with whom we are making this bloc have sinned considerably against the workers. They will have to work actively to make up for their past. They will be able to do this only through proving through action that they are willing to fight in the interests of the workers, that is, to fight for union conditions in the shops, to fight against every leadership which will pursue harmful policies in the union and in relation to the bosses." **(Rev. Age, No. 4.)**

That Levy will "work actively" in the future (for Sigmanism) is incontestable. That he will "make up for their past" by continuing to gut the real Left wing movement, by betraying the workers' interests, by trying to expel the militants once more as soon as they threaten all the sections of the bureaucracy—that is equally incontestable. The Lovestoneites mean something else, however. They consciously spread the illusion that the fake "progressives" a la Levy **have it in them** to "fight in the interests of the workers". What an "independent" leaflet should do is to point out that these people can do no such thing because they represent, in essence, one wing of the capitalist bureaucracy in the union. There is still another aspect to this leaflet: **The Levys**, it says, will have to work actively **in the future** to make up for their black past. That is, they have not yet made up for their past—except, perhaps, by a few harmless words which bind them to nothing. The Lovestoneites, therefore, have made a speculative bloc, based on the "possibility" and "hope" that the Levys will become working class fighters and the leopard will change his spots.

Why does Levy make the bloc? It may be asked. The answer is: Why shouldn't Levy make the bloc? What does he lose by getting the support of the Lovestone group? Nothing! On the contrary, he gets a nice, new, shiny coat of whitewash and a number of votes. But the minimum program of the bloc? What about that? Doesn't it obligate Levy and Co. to a progressive administration? Nothing of the kind. The minimum program of the bloc between the Lovestone group and Levy (printed in full in **Rev. Age**, No 4), has a distinctly reactionary foundation, upon which are erected a number of other points which nine avowed reactionaries out of ten in the I. L. G. W. U. would acknowledge as correct. The main point in the bloc's program reads:

6. **"We fight against every clique rule in the union** because we want that the union should be conducted in an honest, democratic and progressive manner through the membership of the union. No discrimination, persecutions or any sort of swindles must be practiced at meetings and elections of any sort."

So far as the Lovestone section of the bloc is concerned, this sort represents a betrayal of Communism, neither more nor less. The "fight against every clique rule in the union" is directed essentially at the Communists, and specifically at the official party. This reactionary slogan has become the time-worn rallying banner of every bureaucrat in the labor movement who is threatened by the militant workers whose vanguard is everywhere constituted by the Communists. It is the main "practical" aspect of the theory of "no politics in the union" fathered on the one side by the Gompers hierarchy and on the other by the latter-day reactionary philosophers of syndicalism —the theory which always means no revolutionary politics in the union, no **working class** politics, but **bourgeois** politics. "No politics" in the A. F. of L. always meant Democratic and Republican party politics. "No clique control" in the French trade union movement today means, so far as the triple alliance of Right wing (Sellier, Lovestone's colleague), the "progressives" in the reformist trade unions, and the syndicalists in the Left unions are concerned means swinging as many workers as possible into the Right wing union under the actual control of the French Socialist Party.

More than three years ago, Gold, head of the Furriers' Left wing, made a bloc with the Sorkin group of "progressive" bureaucrats, in which "no clique control" was also the outstanding point. At that time, the Lovestone group, though in control of the party, was still compelled by the protest of the party minority to condemn Gold and repudiate this reactionary point **as a betrayal of Communism.** What a perfect contrast would be presented by printing, side by side, the minimum program of the Levy-Lovestone bloc and the 1927 Party Political Bureau condemnation of the Gold-Sorkin bloc! But Lovestone will not print it. He is too busily engaged in liquidating Communism.

LOVESTONE DISCOVERS THE REVOLT IN THE S. P. . . .

"The revolt of the membership in the social democracy and a pronounced Leftward movement primarily among the socialist youth is not a phenonenon limited to Germany," we learned from **Revolutionary Age** (No. 5); "it is manifesting itself in various forms in a number of countries including the U. S. A. Here, too, the Yipsels are playing a prominent rôle in the struggle within the Socialist party against the gross reformism which characterizes that party's political line and leadership."

There is no doubt of the development in the ranks of reformism of a Leftward movement of the workers. Only a Stalinist functionary, blinded by the scintillating phraseology of the "third period", which divides the working class into Communists on the one side and "social fascists" on the other, can deny its existence. The Leftward movement in the social democracy flows from the antagonism between the treacherous course of the socialist bureaucracy and the class interests of the workers in the ranks. This antagonism creates a chasm between the top and bottom layers of the social democracy. The problem of the Communists is to win the "bottom", the workers, to the revolutionary movement by deepening the chasm and making it unbridgeable. This can only be done by the maintenance of the sharpest intransigeance in principle and the application of the policy of the united front on issues of the day. To set these workers in motion for militant struggle requires their disillusionment with the theory and practise of reformism, in other words, the dislodgment of the reformist Leadership.

In seeking to solve the problem of winning the Leftward moving socialist workers, the Communists are confronted by an extremely dangerous foe: the Left wing of reformism. Their function is to serve as a bond between the avowed class collaborationists and the discontented workers, to bridge the ever widening chasm. The fact that they straddle the two is due, first, to the fact that the workers are pulling in different directions, and second—what is even more important for us—to the fact that they hope to draw their two points of support together again. Purcell came forward as a "Left winger" in order to hold the workers in the organized camp of Thomas and MacDonald, and—when the time was ripe—to bind them to the latter ideologically again The fact that he was given such invaluable aid in this work by Stalin-Bucharin and Co. does not change the essential character of his rôle. We name Purcell only as a symbol for Seydewitz in Germany, Zyromski in France, and on a much smaller scale, for Stanley, leader of the American S. P. "Left." These are not confused workers groping for the revolutionary road: they are skilled leaders who aim to make reformism **radical** enough to retain the restless workers and yet keep it **reformist** enough to mollify the far-sighted Hillquits. Against this "Left" variety of reformist leadership, the Communists can conduct only the most implacable and irreconcilable struggle.

the Leninist period of the Comintern, this . always the policy pursued, and with exce t results for the movement. It was this relentless attitude that prevented the International from being diluted and corrupted by such people as Crispien and Dittmann in Germany, who even pretended at one time to support the idea of the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet system. Even in the United States, the Comintern warned the revolutionary workers against such Centrists as Engdahl, Kruse, Olgin, Trachtenberg and Co., who were even more "radical" in their words than Crispien was or than Stanley is today. Now that Lovestone, in his feverish hunt for allies, has discovered the S. P. "Left wing", let us see how he approaches these miniature Crispiens. In the report of the New York convention of the S. P. dealing with the trade union question we read:

"The discussion was rather inadequate as far as the supporters of the Stanley resolution were concerned. Not once during the discussion did they refer to the fusion of the Socialist Party leadership with the trade union bureaucracy. **They avoided in the discussion on and in the resolution the demand for organization of the socialists into groups in the various organizations."** (Rev. Age, No. 6. Our emphasis.)

Incredible as it sounds, it is there—black on white. The principal complaint Lovestone lodges against the Stanley group is that they failed to fight for the organization of socialist party members into trade union fractions! But fractions are organized for the purpose of extending their party's ideological and organizational influence and control in the unions. At least that is the aim of the Communist fractions: we assume that it would hold equally true for socialist fractions. But since when has it become the task of the Communists to demand the organization of the reformists into compact fractions which must inevitably seek to liquidate the influence of Communism? We have always been under the impression that it is the duty of the Communists to make it impossible for reformist fractions to establish themselves. The Right wing liquidators, in their march from Communism to the social democracy, pick up their natural allies on the left flank of the latter. And to make their newly-discovered allies acceptable to their own soldiers, to the workers in the Lovestone group who want to remain Communists, the Lovestone leaders must needs present the Stanleys in a favorable light by monstrously exaggerating their "revolutionary" caliber:

"The clearest expression of the differences within the S. P.," the report therefore continues, "is to be found in the question of the attitude to the Soviet Union."

That is true, not in the sense of the liberals whose interest in the Soviet Union is limited to its existence as an "interesting experiment" and an object of American diplomatic recognition, but in the sense of its realization of revolutionary strategy and principles of Marxism. Now, Lovestone adds:

"The resolution submitted by the Stanley group is one of the clearest and most consistently Left (! !) resolutions that has come from any group in the S. P. since the 1919-21 split. It is a resolution which, basing itself on the proletarian character of the Soviet state, very closely approximates a Communist position." **(Rev. Age, No. 6.)**

"Close" enough, we take it, to make unity between Lovestone and Stanley both desirable and attainable. This is not at all a fantasy. Quite the contrary. Lovestone already has one foot in the camp of Muste. Standing right next to Muste in the C. P. L. A. is Stanley. To think that the Muste-Lovestone unification involves only a "trade union bloc" is to entertain the utterly grotesque notion that there are two distinctly different Stanleys: the partisan of Muste and the leader of the S. P. "Left wing". It is clear: Lovestone is reconciling his group, in the characteristic manner of the opportunist, to a return to the fold, as we will see in another minute. The rate of speed is a subsidiary consideration: the forms of this reconciliation and the stages it will pass through, are also of secondary importance. Will it, for instance, go through the stage of a Two-and-a-Half International movement? It may, because the component elements are at hand, in various stages of development: the Muste faction of the C. P. L. A. (ardent admirers all of the I. L. P.), Lovestone, the Stanley group, the group around the Italian Musteite daily, **Il Nuovo Mondo**, strong tendencies around the German **Volkszeitung** and the **Verband Internationaler Arbeiter**, etc., etc. But that would only be a half-way house of short occupation. The S. P. looms ahead.

ZAM DISCOVERS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN S. P. AND S. L. P.

Lovestone going back to the S. P.? Isn't that a bit strong? Doesn't he claim to be a faction of the Communist party? Doesn't he even go so far as to demand that the party return to Leninism? But pretension and intention are two different things. What Lovestone **pretends** to aim towards we find out from his "holiday" pronouncements. What he **intends** to do we find out by examining the various measures of "preparation" to lead the Communist workers off the revolutionary path. Not the least of these measures is the one assigned to Zam, who has been sent forth like a scout into the far lands of the socialist party and who has returned with glowing accounts: Yea, they are flowing with milk and honey.

Zam's findings are recorded in two illuminating articles in the **Revolutionary Age** (Nos. 5 and 6), "Lenin or DeLeon", which have as their aim to prove the superiority of the Socialist party over the official Communist party as a hunting ground for the Lovestone faction. How? By showing that, first, the S. P. was more fertile ground for Communism than the S. L. P., and second, that the official C. P. today is more or less identical with the S. L. P.; therefore, it appears, the S. P. is more fertile ground for Communism than the C. P. But let us have Zam's own words, which, with all the circumspection of the cowardly opportunist, are sufficiently eloquent:

1. "It was not the 'revolutionary' S. L. P. but the 'reformist' S. P. [Why is "reformist" quoted?] that gave birth to the Communist movement . . . The looseness of and lack of discipline in the S. P. made it possible for a revolutionary wing to develop within it and to secure leadership over the mass of its members, which led to the establishment of various Left wing groupings and papers, and finally to the original Left wing which became the Communist Party."

2 But the strictly disciplined and centralized S. L. P. made **impossible** such a development. On the contrary, every new tendency in the S. L. P. was crushed with a ruthless hand, and expulsions became a by-word"

Continued on page 8

Manuilsky on "Democratic Dictatorship"

A Retreat in Full Disorder

In the anniversary number of **Pravda** (November 7), Manuilsky once more shows what the present leadership of the Comintern is worth. We will analyze briefly that part of his anniversary reflections devoted to China, and which amounts, in essence, to a cowardly, consciously confused, and therefore all the more dangerous semi-capitulation to the theory of the permanent revolution.

1. "A revolutionray-democratic dictatorship of the peasantry and proletariat in China", Manuilsky writes, "will differ essentially from the democratic dictatorship outlined [!] by the Bolsheviks in the 1905-06 revolution."

The democratic dictatorship was "outlined" by the Bolsheviks not only in 1905 but also in 1917 and in all the years between the two revolutions. But only **outlined.** Events served as a test. Manuilsky, like his teacher Stalin, does not reflect upon the points of resemblance and the points of difference of the Chinese revolution with the three Russian revolutions—no, with such comparisons they would be unable to preserve the fiction of the democratic dictatorship, and together with it, the fiction of their theoretical reputations. Therefore these gentlemen do not compare the Chinese revolution with the real Russian revolution, but with the one that was "outlined". It is much easier in this way to confuse and to throw dust in the eyes.

Russia and China

2. In what respect then does the revolution taking place in China differ from the one "outlined" in Russia? In fact, we are taught by Manuilsky, that the Chinese revolution is directed against the "whole system of world imperialism!" It is true that this was the basis upon which Manuilsky yesterday depended for the revolutionary rôle of the Chinese bourgeoisie as against the Bolshevik position "outlined in 1905." Today, however, Manuilsky's conclusions are different: "The difficulties of the Chinese revolution are tremendous: and this is precisely why the victorious movement of the Chinese Red Army on the industrial centers of China had to halt at Changsha." It would have been much more simple and honest to say that the partisan peasant detachments, **in the absence of revolutionary uprisings in the cities,** found themselves powerless to take possession of the industrial and political centers of the country. Wasn't this clear to Marxists beforehand?

But Manuilsky must needs rescue Stalin's speech at the Sixteenth Congress. Here is how he fulfills this task: "The Chinese revolution has at its disposal a Red Army, it is in possession of a considerable territory, at this very moment it is creating on this territory a Soviet system of workers' and peasants' power in whose government the Communists are in the majority. And this condition permits the proletariat to realize not only an ideological but also a **state hegemony over the peasantry."** (Our emphasis.)

The fact that the Communists, as the revolutionary and most self-sacrificing elements, appear at the head of the peasant movement and the armed peasant detachments is quite natural in itself and is also extraordinarily important in the symptomatic sense. But this does not change the fact that the Chinese workers find themselves throughout their vast country under the heel of the Chinese bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism. In what way can the proletariat realize "state hegemony" over the peasantry, when the state power is not in its hands? It is absolutely impossible to understand this. The leading rôle of the isolated Communists and the isolated Communists groups in the peasant war does not decide the question of power. Classes decide and not parties. The peasant war may support the dictatorship of the proletariat, if they coincide in point of time, but under no circumstances can it be substituted for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Is it possible that the "leaders" of the Comintern have not learned even this from the experiences of the three Russian revolutions?

Manuilsky's Democratic Tasks

3. Let us listen to Manuilsky further: "All these [?] conditions lead to the fact that a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship in China will be confronted with the necessity of a **consistent confiscation of the enterprises belonging to foreign and Chinese capital."** (Our emphasis.)

"All these conditions" is a commonplace whose purpose is to cover up the gap that was created in the old position. But the center of gravity in the phrase quoted above is not in "all these conditions" but in one single "condition": Manuilsky has been instructed to maneuver away from the democratic dictatorship and to cover up the traces. This is why Manuilsky so diligently, but not very skilfully, wags his tail.

The democratic dictatorship can be contrasted only to the proletarian socialist dictatorship. The one differs from the other by the character of the class holding power and by the social content of its historical work. If the democratic dictatorship is to occupy itself not with clearing the road for capitalist development, as the Bolshevik schema "outlined in 1905" stated, but on the contrary, with a "consistent confiscation of the enterprises belonging to foreign and Chinese capital", as "outlined" by Manuilsky, then we ask: Wherein does this **democratic** dictatorship differ from the **socialist?** In no way. Then does it mean that Manuilsky, for the second time after a lapse of twelve years, has bitten into the apple of the "permanent" theory? He bit without really taking a bite: this will yet be seen.

4. We read one phrase after another. "The presence of socialist elements will be the specific [!] peculiarity of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in China." Not a bad "specific" peculiarity!

The democratic dictatorship was always thought of by the Bolsheviks as a **bourgeois**-democratic dictatorship, and not as a superclass one, and was contrasted to the **socialist** dictatorship only in this—the only possible—sense. Now it appears that in China there will be a "democratic dictatorship with socialist elements". Between the bourgeois and socialist régimes the class abyss thus disappears, everything is dissolved into pure democracy, and this pure democracy is supplemented gradually and planfully by "socialist elements".

The Tutor of Manuilsky

Who did these people learn from? From Victor Chernov. It is precisely he who, in 1905-06, outlined such a Russian revolution as would be neither bourgeois nor socialist, but democratic and would gradually be supplemented by socialist elements. No, Manuilsky did not make much use of the apple of wisdom!

5. Further: the Chinese revolution in its transition from capitalism to socialism will have more intermediate stages than our October revolution; but the periods of its **growing over** into a socialist revolution will be considerably shorter than the periods outlined (!) by the Bolsheviks for the democratic dictatorship in 1905.

Our astrologer has drawn the balance to everything in advance: to the stages, to the periods, and the length of the periods. He only forgot the A B C of Communism. It appears that under democracy, capitalism will **grow over** into socialism in a series of stages. And the power—will it remain the same in this process or will it change? What class will hold power under the democratic dictatorship and what class under the socialist? If different classes will hold power then they can supplant each other only by a new revolution, and not through the "growing over" of the power of one class into the power of another. On the other hand, if it is assumed that in both periods one and the same class will dominate, that is, the proletariat, then what is the meaning of the democratic dictatorship as against the proletarian? To this there is no answer. And there will not be. Manuilsky is ordered not to clear up the question but to cover up the traces.

In the October revolution, the democratic **tasks** grew over into socialist—under the unchanged domination of the proletariat. One can therefore draw a distinction (it is understood, only relatively) between the democratic period of the October revolution and the socialist period; but one cannot distinguish between the democratic and the socialist dictatorships because the democratic was—non-existent.

In addition, we have heard from Manuilsky that in China the democratic dictatorship, from the very beginning, will be confronted with a consistent confiscation of the enterprises, which means the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. This means that there will not even be a democratic stage of the proletarian dictatorship. Under these conditions, where will the democratic dictatorship come from?

Manuilsky's injudicious construction would be entirely impossible were he to compare the Chinese revolution with the Russian as it actually developed, and not with the one that was "outlined", and at that, to confuse and distort the outline. And to what purpose is all this? In order to retreat without retreating, in order to give up the reactionary formula of the democratic dictatorship or, as they say in China, to save face. But on the face of Stalin-Manuilsky have already written, first, Chiang Kai-Shek and then Wang Chin Wei. Enough! The face is already sufficiently descriptive. They will no longer succeed in saving it. Manuilsky's theoretical confusion is directed against the basic interests of the Chinese revolution. The Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists will reveal this.

A Ferment in the German Right Wing Group

BERLIN—

The more acute the crisis becomes in Russia, the quicker the Rights are forced to take an open position regarding the fundamental questions of socialist construction.

The leadership of the Rights has had to express itself on these questions only of late. After **Bucharin** had once more—perhaps finally — capitulated, Brandler and Thalheimer hastened to emphasize in loud and audible tones their **approbation of Stalin's general line.**

Brandler's perspective is very transparent. Departing from the view that a victory for fascism in Germany would mean an extraordinary aggravation of the war danger for the Soviet Union, he is hoping that thru the complete failure of the party leadership in the struggle for the masses, Stalin will be forced to drop Thälmann-Remmele-Neumann, or, at least, to form a coalition central committee of Centrists and Rights. All the preparations are now being made for this longed-for bloc. Brandler knows that the E. C. C. I. is **ready to concede in purely German questions,** provided the correctness of the Stalinist general line is acknowledged. Thus, for instance, a compromise has been concluded between the party leadership and the **Ullstein nucleus,** the strongest in the party. The nucleus was readmitted after it had remained outside the party for months. Such a compromise was possible—as the nucleus leaders in their consultations with us had declared from the first—only after their approval of the Stalinist general line had safe-guarded the retreat.

While Brandler-Thalheimer are adopting a course towards Stalin, there is growing, on the soil of the opportunism sown by them, a conception among the membership of the Rights that the C. P. G. can be considered as already lost. In a whole series of organizations throughout the country, the Rights are adopting a path towards a split in the left S. P. G. and for a new edition of the Independent S. P. G.—that is, towards capitulation. Fundametnally, these two tendencies are not to be distinguished from one another and will separate only when the hopes of Brandler are realized, when Stalin grants acceptable conditions for capitulation. Momentarily, this does not seem to be the case.

Of late, a **third tendency** has begun to crystalize among the Rights, in Berlin as well as in the country. Doubtless this tendency has come under the influence of our own clarification work. A tendency of Left conciliators is being formed which has not yet been consolidated into a group, which is as yet in itself incoherent, but whose development we must follow with the greatest attention. This tendency of Left conciliators which is represented in Czecho-Slovakia by Michalec, and in Austria by Isa Strasser, is represented in Germany by Frölich, Walcher and Enderle. Frölich goes a good bit further than the others. In the membership meeting of the Berlin Rights he stated:

"Our decisive mistake was the fact that we did not recognize the correctness of Trotsky's proposals in 1927, when he demanded a rational and appropriate tempo of industrialization and collectivization. Trotsky's pamphlet on the German situation contains a wealth of positive points of view. We must attempt to come closer to these groups."

However, in the resolution introduced by Walcher, Enderle and himself, the political shyness—shall we say—of the Left conciliators finds very strong expression. The loyal critics of the Thalheimer tendency do not even dare to declare that they consider the theory of socialism in one country to be false, but content themselves with talmudistically diplomatic remarks.

"We must state that the realization of socialism is not only a social-economic and technical problem. The tasks of socialism can only be completed as the conscious work of the working class. The working class can become mature for this work only through its own conscious activity."

Thus the altogether too shy Left conciliators try to remove the question of socialist construction from the **central** question of perspective (national socialist society or solution of the contradictions by the international revolution), to the question of the internal régime of the party, in the factories, etc.

The professional opportunists of Brandler's or Thalheimer's cut naturally detect in this tendency a very serious danger. It is true that they do not particularly fear the "loyal opposition" (Walcher, Frölich, Enderle, Rosie Wolfstein, Erna Halbe, Jacob Schlör, etc.) but they do fear and rightly so, that the poison of "Trotskyism" will penetrate into the cadres of the Rights. And so Brandler again paints the specter of "anti-Bolshevism" on the wall and proves by old factional documents that he and Thalheimer had already in Moscow taken a position against Trotskyism **without any reservations,** and that the "Opposition now demands a revision of our basic views". The means by which Brandler-Thalheimer and Leo (Thalheimer's young man) proceed against their loyal opposition, are known from the days of the Brandler C. E. C., and have not changed in the least: banality, which masquerades as "proletarian bluntness" (Brandler, the building trades worker), the application of the clumsiest demagogic twists in order to distort the views of the Opposition.

At the plenum of the Rights on December 4, the Brandler majority received 91 votes while the minority numbered 43. At the national conference of the Right wing on December 13, the Berlin organization is to be presented by three delegates of the minority and two of the minority. These internal struggles of the Rights are partially reflected in their press. **Gegen den Strom,** No. 49, publishes a discussion article of the Brandlerite Hubert, who goes quite a bit further than even Frölich, nevertheless still dragging along all the trappings of Left conciliationism. At any rate, this comrade has read our literature—and not without profit—as his position on the Russian economic problems shows. Among other things, he says:

"No further clarification is necessary to establish the fact that collectivization can raise the productivity of agriculture only in the measure in which the state is able to provide the necessary technical basis.

"With an exaggerated tempo, the danger always exists that the prescribed quantity will be obtained at the cost of quality . . . "

At the same time, Hubert declares that "the shooting of three Trotskyists and the course towards the physical destruction of prominent Oppositionists" (Hubert, of course, means primarily Rakovsky, but does not mention his name) will have "disintegrating effects" on the party.

Hubert then turns in his article against "the demagogic polemics of Stalin against Trotsky, Bucharin, Rykov, etc., at the Sixteenth Party Congress" and demands:

"We non-Russian Communists must defend the point of view that the voice of the Oppositionists must be given expression on the basis of party democracy and that solitary confinement, expulsion, banishment, exile (Trotsky) must be revoked. . . "

Hubert does not differentiate between Lefts and Rights. He opposes Stalin's attack against the Lefts as well as against the Rights. That is the **sheerest sort of ciliationism.** We are not opposed in principle to the struggle of the party against members who hold different views, not even to organizational measures when there is no other way left. But we will resist with all our power a **Centrist** party bureaucracy which has been usurping power through force and unprecedented pressure, expelling and persecuting the **revolutionary** Bolshevik group. It was **we** who demanded the struggle against the **Rights.**

When we look **with great scepticism** on Stalin's struggle against the Rights, it is because Stalin, through his adventurist policies since the middle of 1928, has created a much stronger basis for a consolidation of the Rights than the purely administrative expulsion campaign contributes to weaken them. Bucharin may capitulate ten times over, Stalin himself is creating every hour the prerequisites for a new growth of less famous but nevertheless more substantial leaders of the Right. We must look these facts in the eye and draw the conclusions from them.

At any rate, this voice of an "unknown" in the paper of the Rights is remarkable proof that the wise doctors of the Thalheimer school have not as yet found an effective method against the "poison of Trotskyism".

We Left wingers nurture no illusions. But we are attentively observing these processes and we will leave no stone unturned to point out the road forward to the workers of the Right wing.

The Russian Bolshevik-Leninists on the Present Situation

(We publish here only the conclusion of the declaration of Rakovsky and his comrades. We hope to publish the balance of it in an early issue.—Ed.)

In its declaration made to the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission on October 4, 1929, the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition pointed out the need for a unification of all the Communist and revolutionary forces around the five year plan of industrialization, for the struggle against agrarian capitalism and against the Right wingers. Such a unification, embracing also the Democratic Centralists, on the basis of a recognition of a monolithic Party, is still most indispensable today when the solid proletarian ranks must be opposed to an advancing Thermidor. To the extent, however, that the realization of the slogan for unification of all Communist forces signifies the end of the period of the political monopoly of Centrism, the Centrist bureaucracy will fight against it with the same fury as in the past. **The slogan of the unification of all the revolutionary Communists can be realized solely by the masses of the Party in the struggle against the Centrist bureaucracy.**

The Class Relationships

What are the class relationships within the country? The political situation is characterized by distrust on the part of the Party—thoroughly merited — towards its leadership, and the growth of the distrust of the working class, of the poor and middle peasantry towards the Party and the proletarian dictatorship, which is not merited. The leadership has discredited itself by manifesting with material evidence the unprincipled character of its policy which has changed so many times in a few weeks (for instance: the resolution of the Moscow Party Committee on the abolition of the New Economic Policy, which was itself abolished after a few weeks because, we were told later, it was a mistake of the . . . typist). In the eyes of the working masses, the leadership of the Party has discredited the Party and the trade unions. Neither the first nor the second has been able to give the proletariat any defense against the bureaucrats. On the contrary, the Party and the trade unions seemed to support the bureaucrats against the workers.

The poor peasantry has treated the complete collectivization with great distrust. The facts are witness to that. In it, it has seen, on the one hand, a deprivation from the tax exemptions it enjoyed up to then, and on the other, the danger of being submitted to the middle peasants and the Kulaks who joined in with the collective farms. (The facts show that even in the communal farms, the cards are staked on the peasant proprietor). The socalled groups of poor peasants are a fiction analogous to what, for the workers, are self-criticism, purging of the Party, patronage, and the other shoddy bureaucratic substitutes for Party and workers' democracy.

The **agricultural workers,** willy-nilly, had to enter the collective farms, for there was no other way out for them.

A special role will be played in the coming period by the **middle peasant.** He is becoming again the central figure in the class struggle. The love of the Centrists (and the Right wingers for the middle peasantry was pure demagogy, a means of hunting down the Bolshevik-Leninist Oppositionists. In effect, the Centrists and the Right wingers gave the middle peasantry an apparatus, the mouth of which utters more threats than words, threats which influence by violence and arbitrariness, and apropos of which Lenin said that it humiliates the Soviet citizens who are obliged to be in contact with it.

The Middle Peasant in the Collectives

In the complete collectivization, the middle peasant has seen primarily a means to extort bread and other products for himself and to overwhelm with good will the poor peasantry with the aid of his live and dead stock (instruments, beasts, etc.) Instead of the example of which Lenin and the program of our Party speak—the living example which should convince and persuade the middle peasant of the advantages of the collectives—he is offered a noose. To a collectivization of this sort, he has replied with his usual procedure: the active and passive strike, or entrance into the collective in order to break it up from within, by technical disarmanent (destruction of beasts, etc.)

The political task now put before the Party consists of reestablishing the confidence whose lack facilitates the work of the subterranean Thermidorian forces. No serious struggle against advancing capital-'sm is imaginable unless the principal posi-ons of the Party have first been consoli-ated—the proletariat and the poor peasantry.

Theoretically, this problem is solved with relative ease insofar as it is a question of the working class and the agricultural day laborers. The matter is more difficult with the middle peasant. Will he be satisfied with the reesablishment of the N. E. P., and revolutionary legality, or will he ask for the Neo-N. E. P. and supplementary demands which are incompatible with the existence of the proletarian dictatorship? How is the middle peasantry to be satisfied without ceasing the struggle against the Kulak? It is already a question that can be settled with clarity in practice. We can only affirm with precision that the establishment of Party and workers' democracy and the Union of Poor Peasantry against which the bureaucracy revolts, is the means by which the demands of the middle peasantry can be kept within limits compatible with the foundations of the proletarian dictatorship. Democracy in the Party, as well as Soviet democracy in the country, will be the shield against unbridled bureaucratic arbitrariness. Without the establishment of a free regime within the Party, the middle peasantry will not believe that revolutionary legality is really established.

The period of politically deceitful slogans is passed. Only an honest and conscientious Communist policy can save the proletarian dictatorship. The Sixteenth Congress of the Party takes on an exclusively serious importance. It is most likely, however, that the Centrist leadership will seek to make it the most insignificant Congress ever held. Even though the Congress is already on the threshold, no matter what the discussions are in the Party, we can have no illusions. The Party cannot permit such a contempt of its rights. Especially must it reject it at such a critical moment.

The Demands of the Opposition

The whole world has seen the Centre-Right bureaucracy at work. The results are at hand. Every member of the Party sees them around him. We demand a free discussion in the Party and free elections to the Congress. In the discussions and the elections, every shade of Opposition should participate which recognizes the principles of the united Party and the road of **reform.**

We demand the liberation of the incarcerated Oppositionists, and the withdrawal of the application of Article 58. We demand the recall of L. D. Trotsky from exile and his reinstatement into the Party.

We demand that the Central Committee publish the existing documents of the Opposition in the period of 1927-30, and also the articles by Lenin on the national question as well as his political testament. These demands are only preliminary. The question of Party and workers' democracy must be posed in all amplitude before the Congress itself.

Without Party and workers' democracy, all the corrections will inevitably be converted into deformations. Only the revolutionary control of the masses is in a position to keep the apparatus under its hand. We deem indispensable the reorganization of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission and the restitution to the Congress and the Party of the rights torn away from them formally and transferred to the C. C. and C. C. C.

We deem indispensable the suppression of the post of general secretary and to diminish the role of the Party secretary to the execution of technical functions, with the transference of the political functions to the Political Bureau as a whole.

We deem indispensable the changing of the present method of allocating work to the members of the Party.

We demand the complete reorganization of the Organizing Bureau, which is today the principal prop of the apparatus dictatorship.

We demand the extension to all the elective organs of the Party of the system existing at the elections of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

We demand a substantial reduction of the Party apparatus, as well as that of the trade unions, cooperatives, the state.—in order to liberate resources and to destine them for additional investment in the construction of Soviet and collective farms, and for fundamental investment in industry.

We repeat our demand of October 4, 1929: the thorough adjustment of the five year plan, as to its internal parts and as to the needs of the working class—the revision of the collective agreements in the sense of an improvement of the material conditions of the working class, the scrupulous examination of the results of the uninterrupted working week considered as a temporary, **exceptional** measure, admissable only with the agreement of the workers, the establishment of a bond between the nominal wage and the increase of the budget, the reestablishment of the real activity of the trade unions.

The policy of the Party in the country: formal abolition of the complete collectivization, halting of the de-Kulakization in mass, and the explusion of the Kulaks from the countryside, except in isolated cases provided for by law, but without bringing the already expelled Kulaks back to their former localities.

The Poor Peasants' Unions

Exceptional attention by the state to the movements of the collectives, by giving them necessary financial and technical aid, creation of Unions of Poor Peasants. This measure is indispensable for creating a political base for the collective farms movement and as a political support both for loan policies and social culture in the country.*

The question of settling the problem of providing the country with food products and agricultural raw materials, through consolidating the building of collectives, while conserving the rhythm of industrial development, is now put before the Party. It is an unquestionably heavy task, but it is converted into a practical, even technical task, if the political premises for its solution are created.

We propose no new program to the Party, we are only fighting for the reestablishment of the old program tested in hard combats and in glorious victories, and of the tactical line of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

April 1930.

Christian Rakovsky.
V. Kossior.
N. Muralov.

---

* In the meantime, the Centrist leadership, which does not permit Unions of Poor Peasants in a part of the territory of the U. S. S. R., is obliged to admit them in the Ukraine, and to put in their hands the work of collectivization. The Committees of Poor Peasants in the Ukraine were maintained because they knew how to defend themselves and did not permit the policy of liquidation of the years 1924-25 to go further than to transform them from organizations of a semi-compulsory type into organizations of a free type.

Introduction

After some delay, we have finally received the declaration of comrades Rakovsky, Muralov, Kossior and Kasparova with which these comrades addressed themselves to the Party a little before the Sixteenth Congress. By a fatal chance, the copies of the declaration sent to us at the time were seized. In spite of this great delay, the document which we publish entirely retains its importance. In spite of the terseness of formulation, the document presents clear estimations of the economic and political processes, calling by their name the dangers which are not far off but quite close.

This declaration is intimately linked with the declaration that Rakovsky made at the time when Centrism's turn to the Left still preserved its freshness and was not sufficiently checked by experience. And at the same time, these two documents are distinguished as two steps of different stages on the same road. The first declaration recorded the turn of the leadership in the sense which the Opposition defended for the past number of years. At the same time, it warned against the possible dangers on the new road, demanded the activity of the Party to surmount these dangers, and put the forces of the Opposition at the disposal of the Party. This manner of posing the question—in the spirit of the united front policy—appeared to some "capitulationist" or at the very least, semi-capitulationist. To be sure, these accusations didn't come from a very serious source.*

Already at that time, we pointed out that politics does not consist of a simple repetition of formulae that can serve in every condition of life. Rakovsky did not entertain the slightest illusion about the political line of Centrism at the time of the Left turn. He clearly and plainly developed his appreciation of Centrism in the theses written at the same time as the first declaration.

* The pretty thin character of this criticism was branded above all by the fact that at its head was inscribed Paz, for whom the accusation of capitulation against Rakovsky was necessary solely in order to abandon the revolutionary ranks, in which he was but a bird of passage. We cannot, however, forget that in a bloc with Paz against Rakovsky, there was also found comrade Treint, who, with all the mistakes he has committed and still commits, is yet, we should like to hope, no chance figure in the arena of the revolutionary struggle.

But the task did not consist of simply repeating in the declaration what was said in the theses, but to assist the Party, even a small part of it, to assimilate what was said in the theses—or at least a part of it. With the stifling of the C. P. S. U., it is very difficult to check what was the immediate repercussion of the first declaration in the ranks of the Party. It cannot, however, be doubted that the declaration of Rakovsky, which made a breach in the wall of lies and calumnies built up by the Stalinists, was one of the causes for the revival of the rabid struggle against the Left Opposition before the Congress. Still, we have another living verification of the question which interests us, outside of the U. S. S. R. Comrade Feroci, one of the leaders of the new Italian Opposition, has told in an article of the great impression produced by Rakovsky's declaration even on the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, and certainly, upon its Left section especially. Thus, the declaration of Rakovsky not only did not bring anybody to capitulate, but on the contrary, served as one of the impulsions to the formation of the new Italian Opposition.

The new declaration we publish now for the first time, draws the balance to the policy of the Left turn at the very moment of a new half-turn to the Right. All these circumstances are submitted in the document to a clear appreciation to which little can be added today. We consider it necessary to emphasize only two points.

The Union of Peasant Poor

In the declaration, they mention that while preventing the creation of the Union of the Poor Peasantry, the Stalinist leadership nevertheless tolerates this organization in the Ukraine. It should merely be added that if the attempt by Stalin-Bucharin-Rykov-Kamenev and others in 1924-25, to suppress the organization of the poor Ukrainian peasantry did not succeed, it is solely thanks to the firm opposition of the revolutionary wing of the Ukrainian Party under the leadership of comrade Rakovsky.

The second point we wish to speak of here deals with the capitulators. The declaration establishes, with perfect justice and pitilessly, that these people have lost "any right at all to the confidence of the Party and the working class." In natural connection with this, the declaration repeats that no persecutions will prevent the Leninist Opposition from fulfilling its duty to the very end.

October 22, 1930. L. TROTSKY.

No. 17-18

BULLETIN of the RUSSIAN OPPOSITION

The latest issue of the official organ of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition, published as a double number, has just been received. Some of the material contained in this highly interesting issue is as follows:

Success of Socialism and the Dangers of Adventurism — Declaration of comrade Rakovsky and Others—Statement of Rakovsky, Muralov and Others to the Central Committee of the Russian Party — Comrade Selin'tchenko in Stalinist Exile — A New Victim of Stalin (Comrade Kote Zinzadze) — Lessons of the Moscow Trial — What Next? — The Bloc of Right and Left — A Disorderly Retreat—L. Trotsky: On Thermidorianism Bonapartism — Notes of a Journalist —Letters from the U. S. S. R.— Problems of the International Opposition— Etc., etc., etc.

25 Cents a Copy

Order from
THE MILITANT
84 East 10th Street New York, N. Y.

If the number on your wrapper is

61

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues

Stalin-Bucharin and the Chinese Revolution

A LETTER BY TCHEN DU HSIU

Continued from last issue

Comrades! The Central Committee has now created these false reasons in order to expel me from the Party and put the name of "counter-revolutionist" upon me without any proofs. I believe that most of the comrades are not clear about this case. Even the C. C. itself has said: "There may be some who do not understand it!" But they expelled me and said I went over to the counter-revolution when some comrades do not understand it. Nevertheless, I understand quite well why they falsely accuse us as "counter-revolutionists." This is the weapon created by the modern Chinese for attacking those who do not belong to them. For instance, the Kuo Min Tang accuses the Communists of being "counter-revolutionists" in order to cover their own sins. Chiang Kai-Shek tries to deceive the masses with the signboard of revolution, considering himself as the personification of revolution. Those who oppose him are "counter-revolutionists" and "reactionary elements."

Many comrades know that the above-mentioned false reasons given by the C. C. for expelling me are only the formal and official excuse. In reality, they have become tired of hearing my opinions expressed in the Party and of my criticism of their continued opportunism and putschism of the past and their execution of a policy of bankruptcy:

The Question of "Feudal Remnants"

In any number of the bourgeois countries of the entire world, there are feudal relics and methods of semi-feudal exploitation (Negroes and slaves of the South Sea archipelago are like those of the pre-feudalist slave system), and there exist remnants of feudal forces. China is even more like this. In the revolution, of course, we cannot neglect this; but the Comintern and the C. C. unanimously recognize that in China the feudal remnants still occupy the dominant position in economy and politics and hold the ruling position. Therefore, they consider these relics as the object of the revolution and let the enemy, the oppressor of the revolution—the forces of the bourgeoisie—be passed over and regard all reactionary actions of the bourgeoisie as those of the feudal forces.

They say that the Chinese bourgeoisie is still revolutionary, that they can never forever be reactionary, and that all those who are reactionary cannot be the bourgeoisie. Thus, they do not recognize that the Kuo Min Tang represents the interests of the bourgeoisie or that the national government is the regime representing the interests of the bourgeoisie. The conclusion must be that besides the Kuo Min Tang, or the Nanking section of it, there is or will be, now or in the future, a non-reactionary and revolutionary bourgeois party. Therefore, in tactics and in practical actions, they simply follow the Reorganizationists at present, and do the military work of overthrowing Chiang Kai-Shek; in the platform they say that the character of the third revolution in the future must still be that of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, opposing any antagonization of the economic forces of the bourgeoisie and the issuance of the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such an illusion concerning the bourgeoisie and such continual longing for it, are not only calculated to continue the opportunism of the past, but to deepen it. It must lead to a more shameful and sad failure in the future revolution.

The Slogan of Soviets

If we consider the slogan "Establish the Soviet regime" as the slogan of action, we can issue it only when the objective conditions have ripened into a revolutionary wave. It cannot be issued at any time at pleasure. In the past, during the revolutionary wave, we did not adopt the slogans "Organize Soviets" and "Establish the Soviet regime". Naturally, it was a grave error. In the future, when the revolution takes place, we shall immediately have to organize the workers,' peasants' and soldiers' Soviets. Then we shall mobilize the masses to a struggle for the slogan of "Establish the Soviet regime." Furthermore, it would be the Soviet of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and not the Soviet of the workers and peasants democratic dictatorship. In the present period when the counter-revolutionary forces are entirely victorious and when there is no wave of mass revolutionary movement, the objective conditions for "armed uprising" and "Establishment of Soviets" are not matured. At the present time "Establishment of Soviets" is only the propaganda and educational slogan. If we use it as a slogan of action, and mobilize the working class at once to struggle practically for the "Establishment of Soviets", we will certainly be unable to secure the response of the masses.

In the present situation, we should adopt the democratic slogan of "Struggle for the convocation of the National Assembly". The objective conditions for this movement have matured and at present only this slogan can move large masses to issue out of the legal political struggle towards the revolutionary rise and the struggle for the "armed uprising" and the "establishment of the Soviet regime." The present C. C., continuing its putschism, does not do this. They consider that the rebirth of the revolution has matured, and reproach us for regarding the slogan of the "establishment of workers and peasants Soviets" as only a propaganda slogan; thus, they logically consider it a slogan of action. Therefore, they constantly compel the Party members to come to the streets for demonstrations in workers' quarters, and compel employed comrades to strike. Every small daily struggle must be artificially enlarged to a big political struggle, making the working masses and working comrades leave the Party more and more.

More than that, at the Kiangsu representative conference recently, it was resolved "to organize the great strike movement", and "local uprisings". From last summer to the present day, there have been signs of small struggles among the Shanghai workers, but when they appeared they were crushed by the policy of putschism of the Party, and afterwards, of course, they will be constantly crushed. If the resolutions of the Kiangsu representative conference are executed, they will be destroyed. Our Party is already not the guide who helps the wave of the workers' revolutionary struggles to come, but is becoming the executioner rooting up the branches of the workers' struggles.

The present Central Committee, sincerely basing itself upon the bankrupt line of the Sixth Congress, and under the direct guidance of the Comintern, is executing the above bankrupt policy and capping the opportunism and putschism of the past by surrendering the party and the revolution. No matter if it was the Comintern or the Chinese Communist Party which committed the errors of opportunism in the past and made the revolution fail, it was a crime; now these errors have been pointed out plainly by the comrades of the Opposition, but they still do not acknowledge their past mistakes and consciously continue their past erroneous line. Moreover, for the sake of covering up the errors of a few individuals, they deliberately violate the organizational policy of the Bolsheviks, abuse the authority of the supreme party organs, prevent self-criticism within the party, expelling numerous comrades from the party for expressing different political opinions and deliberately splitting the party. This is the crime of crimes, most stupid and most shameful. No Bolshevik should be afraid of open self-criticism before the masses. The only way for the party to win the masses is to carry out self-criticism courageously, never losing the masses for fear of self-criticism. To cover up one's own mistakes, like the present Central Committee, is certainly to lose the masses.

Comrades! All we know is that whoever opens his mouth to express some criticism of the errors of the party is himself expelled, while the mistake remains uncorrected. But we should draw a balance. Which is more important: to save the party from danger or save ourselves from having our names dropped from the party list?

The Policy of Armed Uprisings

Since the "August 7" conference, which determined upon the "general direction of the armed uprising", and the uprisings were carried out in several places, I wrote many letters to the Central Committee at that time, pointing out that the revolutionary sentiment of the masses then was not at a high point, that the régime of the Kuo Min Tang could not be quickly exploded, that the unconditional uprisings only weaken the power of the party and isolate it more from the masses; that we should change the policy of uprisings into that of winning and uniting the masses in their daily struggles. The Central Committee thought that widespread uprisings were an absolutely correct new line for correcting opportunism, and that to estimate the condition of the uprisings and to consider how to insure the success of the uprising, is opportunism. Of course, they never took my opinion into consideration and regarded my words as a joke. They propagated them everywhere, saying that it was proof that I had not corrected my opportunist mistakes. At that time, I was bound by the discipline of the party organization, and took a negative attitude, being unable to go over the head of the organization to struggle determinedly against the policy of the Central Committee in destroying the party.

I am to be held responsible for this. After the Sixth Congress, I still had a false comprehension and still entertained the illusion that the new Central Committee had received so many lessons from events that they themselves would awaken to the fact that it was not necessary to follow blindly the erroneous line of the Comintern after all. I still continued my negative attitude and did not retain any different theories so as to involve a dispute within the party, though I was fundamentally dissatisfied with the line of the Sixth Congress. After the war between the Chiang Kai-Shek and the Kwangsi cliques, and the "May 30" anniversary movement, I felt deeply that the Central Committee would obstinately continue its opportunism and putschism, and manifestly could not change by itself: that except through an open discussion and criticism by the party members, from the lowest to the highest ranks, the seriously false line of the leading organ could not be corrected. But all the party members are under the domination and restriction of party discipline, in a state of "daring to be angry but not daring to speak".

At that time, I could not bear to see the party (created by the warm blood of innumerable comrades) destroyed and ruined under the lasting and essentially false line. Thus I could do nothing but begin to express my opinion from August onward, in order to fulfill my responsibility. Some comrades sought to dissuade me, saying that the people in the Central Committee regard the interests of a few leaders as more important than the interests of the party and the revolution, that they attempted everywhere to cover up their mistakes, and could never accept the criticism of comrades: that since I was criticizing them so frankly, they would use it as an excuse for expelling me from the party. But my regard for the party compelled me to adopt resolutely the path of not caring for my own interests.

(Concluded in Next Issue)

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

By LEON TROTSKY

A brilliant summary and analysis of the policies pursued since 1923 by the leading group in the Communist International on the most important problems confronting the revolutionary movement « « « An invaluable contribution to the issues of the day and an indispensable part of every worker's library » » »

One Hundred Pages

25 cents a copy :: in bundles 18 cents

ORDER FROM THE MILITANT, 84 E. 10th ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Lovestone and the SP

Continued from page 5

3. ". . . the present party and Comintern leaderships have abandoned Leninist tactics in the trade union field in favor of DeLeonism. Not only has this estimate been proven true, but it must be said that along the entire front, the official leaders of the Comintern and of the American Party are joining in the adulation of DeLeon which has up to now been the sole monopoly and incidentally the sole stock in trade of the sectarian S. L. P. . . . The whole course of the party leadership today is a departure from the principles of Leninist strategy in the direction of its direct opposite, DeLeonist sectarianism." (**Rev. Age**, No. 5.)

Since neither Zam nor his commissioners are particularly interested in writing abstract philosophical reminiscences on the respective historical merits of DeLeon's S. L. P. and Hillquit's S. P., it is plain that the comparisons have a very modern and practical purpose. Zam is not prepared to make it clear in all its implications—the Communist workers in the Right wing ranks are not yet fully "prepared." But the implications are there for anyone to see. As for the dummy labelled "S. L. P.", with its "strict discipline", "centralized", "expulsions", "sectarianism"—why, that's not the S. L. P., it's the C. P. that Zam is punching at! And the S. P.? It's just as "loose" and "undisciplined" today as it was when these exemplary qualities enabled a revolutionary wing to develop within it." And what law of nature or politics is to prevent what happened once from happening again? If a revolutionary wing came out of the Socialist party, why can't it go in again? These are the only possible inferences to be drawn from the excursions of the Right wing politicians into history.

Our inference is fortified by a proposal, made three years ago by Lovestone while occupying the post of Communist party secretary, to send a number of party members into the Socialist party "for the purpose of working for our labor party policy in the socialist party" (Polcom Minutes. December 14, 1927). Lovestone's orientation towards the Socialist party did not begin yesterday. Nor did our opposition to it. At that time, comrade Cannon introduced a motion of principle declaring this "tactic" to be false and calling for a policy of frontal attack against the S. P. all along the line, with particular emphasis against the so-called "Lefts". Lovestone was forced to retreat on his proposal at that time, but not to give it up, as is now quite clear.

No, it did not begin yesterday. It is rooted in the whole past history of the post-Leninist régime in the Comintern, which is the history of the war upon "Trotskyism". It is not by chance that Lovestone and Co. were for years the official color-guards of this reactionary campaign against the proletarian wing of the International and the fundamental principles of Marxism it defended. It is not by chance that Lovestone was the one chosen to expel us from the Party, with the brotherly cooperation of Foster, and the papal blessing of Stalin. For a long time the issues were muddled and falsified. For a long time the Communist workers were confused and unable to orientate themselves upon a Marxist course. Lovestone is now helping to clear the atmosphere—in a negative sense—by his natural evolution towards unity with reformism. The Fosters, Browders, Bedachts and Stachels are still doing all they can to obscure the great problems of the Communist movement by their bewildering zig-zags, their unprincipledness, their ignorance. They occupy a no less menacing position today than Lovestone, who grew out of the same soil—the soil of the Stalin-Bucharin bloc— did yesterday. With their ultra-Leftist course, they continued to strengthen the Right wing even after Lovestone's expulsion, and to deceive the Communist workers with this counterfeit "radicalism".

The Communist workers understand the Lovestones and Wolfes better today than they did yesterday. They will understand the Fosters and Browders better tomorrow. It is our work to help them in this understanding in time—in time to preserve the foundations of the Communist movement which the Centrists are undermining, and to rebuild upon them.

In the article "What Next?" contained in the last issue of the Militant, a typographical error occurred which confused the meaning of the conclusions drawn. Where it says: "Without a deep internal struggle this is no longer possible; but we must do everything to exclude from this internal struggle a great service to the Party in the most critical moment. It is not the Bolshevik-Leninists who will assist such an agreement"—it should read: "but we must do everything to keep out of this internal struggle all elements of civil war. An agreement on this basis may do a great service to the party in the most critical moment. It is not the Bolshevik-Leninists who v resist such an agreement."